

THE

SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 956, Vol. 37.

February 21, 1874.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

MR. GLADSTONE'S RESIGNATION.

THE controversy whether a Minister defeated at the elections ought to resign before the meeting of Parliament has already lost its interest; but it is well that constitutional changes, as they become from time to time expedient, should be deliberately adopted and generally understood. There is no doubt that the precedent established by Mr. DISRAELI, and now followed by Mr. GLADSTONE, conduces to public convenience. The embarrassment produced by the temporary continuance in office of a Government about to expire has often been experienced in the United States. By a deviation from the purpose of the framers of the Constitution, the election of a President virtually takes place four months before his appointment by the titular electors who from the first became mere delegates of the constituency. During that period once in every four years, except when the President has, like General GRANT, been re-elected, official power and patronage are divorced from political authority. In some instances, as at the close of Mr. ANDREW JOHNSON's term, the President has ceased to enjoy the confidence of any party, while he still retains his large constitutional prerogative. The same anomaly would be produced on a smaller scale if an English Prime Minister awaited, after the unfavourable result of a general election, an adverse vote in Parliament. The moral influence which supports the legal authority of Government would in the meantime have departed; it would be impossible to frame measures which the Ministers would not afterwards have the opportunity of proposing; and every disposal of place or dignity would be regarded with jealousy, as a vexatious encroachment on the rights of the succeeding Government. On the other hand, it has been forcibly contended that a resignation immediately after an election involves a transfer to the nation at large of the powers of Parliament. It is true that the sovereignty of an Assembly rather than of the collective constituencies is the indispensable condition of freedom and good government; and the most objectionable part of Mr. GLADSTONE's unfortunate address to the electors of Greenwich consisted in his attempt to pass a Budget by a popular vote. The promiscuous votes which are regarded by French Imperialists as the only legitimate foundation of power have hitherto only served to sanction despotism and usurpation; but the creditable scruples of English constitutional critics may be answered by the suggestion that, in resigning his office, Mr. GLADSTONE has merely discounted or anticipated the decision of Parliament. The members of the majority had already in their speeches and addresses announced their intention of opposing Mr. GLADSTONE's Government, and it was courteous and reasonable to suppose that they would not capriciously contradict their professions. It was not from any depreciation of personal prowess that the celestial champion in *Paradise Lost* suggested to his adversary a prudent acquiescence in an inevitable result. Mr. DISRAELI knows Mr. GLADSTONE's force, and Mr. GLADSTONE knows Mr. DISRAELI's, and there would be no use in fighting for a prize which is already awarded. Accordingly the PRIME MINISTER fled, and with him fled the shades of much permanent or temporary unpopularity.

If it were intended to take a division on the election of a Speaker, a curious complication might be produced by the immediate resignation of the outgoing Government. Neither the PRIME MINISTER nor any of his principal colleagues will have seats in the new Parliament when it meets; and yet the first business of the House of Commons is to organize itself by the choice of a Speaker

who, among other functions, must issue writs for the elections to the places which have been vacated. It might therefore happen that, in an important contest, the majority would be deprived of fourteen or fifteen votes and of the advice and influence of all the leaders of the party. No such contingency arose in 1834, because Sir ROBERT PEEL had formed his Administration before the dissolution. Since that time the Speaker has always been chosen or re-elected without a contest. If Mr. GLADSTONE had, in deference to the reported opinion of one member of the Cabinet, determined to await a hostile vote, either the re-election of the Speaker would have been challenged, or the actual Minister must have framed the Speech from the Throne, and have left it to the Opposition to move an amendment to the Address, which would certainly have been carried. Since it would be irregular and indecorous for the QUEEN to deliver a second Speech, the official catalogue of Ministerial measures would become obsolete and impracticable as soon as it had been framed. It is obviously desirable that Mr. DISRAELI should be formally as well as really responsible for the intended legislation of the year; and during the short time which will be allowed for the preparation of his measures, the members of the new Cabinet ought to have unrestricted access to the records of their several departments. The permanent functionaries of the various offices will serve the new Ministers as loyally as they aided their predecessors, but an expectant Secretary of State or Chancellor of the Exchequer could not have held official intercourse with an Under or Assistant-Secretary. It happened that after the General Election of 1841, when an overwhelming majority of Opposition members was returned, the Parliamentary Session was almost at an end. The dissolution took place in June, and it was at the end of August or the beginning of September that Lord MELBOURNE's Government was defeated on a vote of want of confidence. The prorogation followed almost immediately on the appointment of the new Ministry.

Mr. DISRAELI's majority is only half that of Sir ROBERT PEEL, nor can it be said that he commands the personal confidence which was reposed in the former Conservative leader; yet the immediate prospects of the Liberal party are perhaps more hopeless than after the fall of Lord MELBOURNE. Lord JOHN RUSSELL was in 1842 the acknowledged leader of a united minority, for his claims were uniformly recognized by O'CONNELL, who represented the Irish malcontents. Mr. GLADSTONE excels Lord JOHN RUSSELL in Parliamentary eloquence and in official experience, and he will for the present probably not be embarrassed by any mutiny among his adherents; but it is not certain that he is anxious to resume office, or that he will think it worth while to commence the slow process of forming again the Liberal majority which has been dissipated by unskillful or unlucky management. It would be highly injudicious to begin his career as leader of Opposition by violent attacks which the whole country would resent as a protest against its recent decision. Custom and fairness prescribe the practice of giving a new Government a fair trial, unless indeed there is a chance, as in 1835, that it may be at once driven from office. Mr. GLADSTONE's temper and qualities are not well suited to a waiting game, and it is doubtful whether the hope of becoming again Prime Minister four or five years hence would be to him either attractive or admissible. If he were tempted into an immediate display of pugnacity, he would not be followed by the moderate Liberals who in diminished numbers still form a recognized portion of his party. Any leaning to the Irish Home Rule party would be resented by nearly the whole body of Scotch and

English Liberals; and there is no other outlying section with which he could coalesce, as he coalesced with Mr. DISRAELI in two successful assaults on Lord PALMERTON's first Administration. No one suspects Mr. GLADSTONE, though he may be sometimes excited by political passion, of a sordid or selfish eagerness for office. It was well known that his strange delusion about Mr. DISRAELI's refusal to form a Ministry after the defeat of the Government last year was chiefly attributable to his own personal desire for repose. It is not so agreeable to be driven from office as to resign voluntarily at the head of a majority; but in his address to the electors of Greenwich Mr. GLADSTONE declared, with evident sincerity, that he should be not unwilling to retire from office. The Liberal party cannot rely upon their leader to prepare through years of toil and patience their restoration to power.

If Mr. GLADSTONE now, or at a future time, retires from the chief conduct of Opposition, it will be difficult to find a successor to his post. Mr. CARDWELL, who would have been the most available candidate, is about to ascend into a calmer atmosphere. Mr. LOWE, though he is, after Mr. GLADSTONE and Mr. BRIGHT, who would not be a possible chief of Opposition, the most brilliant of the outgoing Ministers, is deficient in the popular qualities which are required in a party leader; nor can the more zealous Liberals be blamed for regarding with imperfect sympathy the former adversary of every measure for the extension of the suffrage. Mr. LOWE himself is not unlikely to place additional embarrassment in the way of any competitor who may be preferred by the party. Possessing, through the considerate care of Mr. DISRAELI, a seat where he is in no danger of being capriciously disturbed, Mr. LOWE will probably devote himself to candid and pungent criticisms on the conduct and measures of the Ministry; nor will he be restrained by the caution of any Opposition leader who may nominally represent the party. Mr. FORSTER is popular in the House, but he is disqualified for the post of leader by the violent animosity which he has unfortunately provoked among the Nonconformist and Secularist section. The selection of Lord HARTINGTON, though it would surprise the country in general, would perhaps be more acceptable than any other to the House of Commons. He possesses two qualities, negative or positive, which would at the present moment be valued above other gifts. He is reputed to be cautious, and he is known not to be eloquent. It is not impossible that the succession may ultimately devolve upon Mr. GOSCHEN or on Sir W. HARROD, but neither has yet attained the Parliamentary position which could entitle him to represent the Liberal party. It must also be remembered that the Liberals are not united among themselves on any definite policy. Some wish to disestablish the Church, or to tamper with property in land, or to extend and redistribute the electoral franchise; but it may be doubted whether a third of the House of Commons could be induced to vote for any fresh political change immediately after the country has expressed an unmistakable desire to leave things for the present alone. Few stranger events have occurred in recent times than the utter collapse of a party which had for a whole generation, and down to the eve of the last election, been regarded by itself and by its opponents as irresistible and supreme.

THE NEW MINISTRY.

WHEN in the spring of last year Mr. GLADSTONE resigned, and it was supposed possible that the Conservatives might take office, it was rumoured that Lord DERBY, and not Mr. DISRAELI, would be Prime Minister. Like most rumours, this rumour was not based on any facts, but was merely a solution that seemed probable to those who speculated on the difficulties which Mr. DISRAELI might have to encounter. These difficulties were mainly two. It was conjectured that Lord SALISBURY and Lord CARNARVON would decline to serve under Mr. DISRAELI; and their loss would be so serious a blow to the party that some device would, it was imagined, be found to make their tenure of office possible, and the only device that suggested itself was that it should not be Mr. DISRAELI under whom they were asked to serve. The second difficulty was that of finding a tolerably capable Chancellor of the Exchequer, if Mr. DISRAELI was not to hold the post. Mr. DISRAELI as a financier can scarcely be called a capable Chancellor of the Exchequer; but what is wanted in a Conservative Chancellor is not so

much the power of devising financial measures as the power of defending them when they are submitted to the criticism of Mr. GLADSTONE. Neither of these difficulties has on the present occasion been suffered to stand in the way of Mr. DISRAELI's Premiership. Lord SALISBURY and Lord CARNARVON have consented to take office under him, and have, it is believed, returned to their old places as heads of the Indian and Colonial Departments. If to either of them the step has been in any way painful, and some feelings of justly offended pride have had to be stifled, it is obvious that they have only made a sacrifice which they were called to make in their own real interests and in those of their party and the country. The temptation which presses on men who have everything that station and wealth can give to isolate themselves, and stand aloof from practical politics, when they have had to undergo personal mortifications, is one which English noblemen are especially called on to resist. The House of Commons presents continually less and less attraction and opening to men of independent character and of such claims as mere knowledge and fitness for political life can give. If Peers who are of a similar type consulted merely their personal feelings, and passed their lives in dignified inactivity, the guidance of public affairs might possibly pass before long into the hands of a class of men who are fitter to be prominent in a new country than in an old one. There are, too, advantages in holding office which no one who wishes to exercise a salutary influence over public affairs can afford to neglect. Lord SALISBURY and Lord CARNARVON have shown great capacity as administrators, but it is only by administering that advance can be made in the difficult art of administration. India and the Colonies could not be in better hands than those in which they will now be placed; but those who will now preside over their destinies cannot fail to gain largely in experience, judgment, and knowledge, by having to leave the attitude of external criticism, and to decide on great questions by the light of those broad principles which cast into the shade the somewhat petty though exciting issues of home politics.

The second difficulty has been met, if not surmounted, by the appointment of Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Probably no better appointment could have been made. Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE is the pupil of Mr. GLADSTONE, and may be trusted not to depart widely or consciously from the main lines of the financial policy of his master. He is not likely to be brilliant as a Chancellor of the Exchequer, but he will be sound and safe, is sure to get up his facts and figures well, and if he cannot always reply to the objections of Mr. GLADSTONE, may console himself with the thought that even the arguments of Mr. GLADSTONE are powerless against a majority of fifty. The real difficulty of the new CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER will not, however, be so much the production of mild unobjectionable Budgets, or the refutation of Mr. GLADSTONE by reasoning or votes, as the control of the spending propensities of his colleagues. The Conservatives come in as the champions of numbers of people who think themselves deprived of that amount of Government money which they consider they are entitled in the nature of things to look for. It is to the Conservatives that clamorous officers and discharged workmen and underpaid postmen have fled for refuge, and the Conservatives have welcomed the suppliants with open arms. To please all these discontented people will cost a great deal of money, and to disappoint them will be to reveal the terrible secret that one party can do no more for them than another. Some, too, of Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE's colleagues have personally strong inducements to get as much money spent on their departments as they can. They have associated their names with the cause of those who have asserted that the late Government was niggardly and meanly unjust. It will be almost impossible for the Duke of RICHMOND to explain to the officers who are dissatisfied with the terms offered when purchase was abolished that they are not to gain anything by the stern and parsimonious CARDWELL being driven out of office. To deal with the question of Local Taxation, again, in the manner in which the bulk of the supporters of the Ministry would like to see it dealt with, would be a very uncomfortable task for a Chancellor of the Exchequer. Up to a certain point, no doubt, a Conservative Chancellor may properly spend more money than a Liberal one. It is quite a tenable proposition that in a great and wealthy country efficiency is of more importance than the saving of halfpence, that

it is foolish not to make the service of the country attractive enough to secure good servants, and that to sell stores one year and buy them back the next is not economy at all. The theory on which the late Ministry proceeded was a totally different one. Their maxim was that the great duty of a Ministry is to take off taxes, and that the only efficacious means of taking off taxes is to hunt up every penny of the national expenditure that can possibly be stopped. Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE is not called on to rival his predecessors in economy. To give a fair price for a good article, not to spend as little as possible, is the Conservative theory. But then this way of looking at finance, though theoretically defensible, is apt practically to lead a Chancellor of the Exchequer into painful difficulties, and firmness of resistance must be the chief quality he has to show.

Fortunately for Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, one of the leading members of the Cabinet may be trusted to be on the side of thrif. Lord DERBY is constantly preaching the gospel of economy, and may be trusted to practise for the benefit of the nation what he preaches. The Foreign Minister can spend nothing on his own department, and the only way in which he can burden the nation is by plunging it into war. No man could be less likely to go to war if he could help it than Lord DERBY. It will be convenient and proper for the Conservatives to proclaim themselves the supporters of a spirited foreign policy, and there can be no serious objection to it provided it never leads to unnecessary war, to blustering interference, or to offending allies. It is not likely that any occasion will present itself to Lord DERBY so embarrassing as the *Alabama* quarrel; and if it does, he will have gained experience at the expense of Lord GRANVILLE, and will know that arbitrations in which England gives up everything beforehand are not the sort of arbitrations that England thinks fair. Under ordinary circumstances, Lord DERBY may be trusted to be quite as pacific as Lord GRANVILLE, and Mr. DISRAELI will be perfectly aware that the one thing that would turn the constituencies speedily round would be the alarm caused by finding that we were always sailing as near war as we dared to go. For some of those mysterious reasons which seem to compel a Prime Minister to put members of his Cabinet in the wrong holes, Mr. HARDY is, it is said, to be taken away from the Home Office and sent to the Admiralty. That Mr. HARDY will do well enough in his new post may be probable, for Mr. GOSCHEN has shown that a First Lord may do very well though he starts without knowing anything of his business. But Mr. HARDY was a first-rate Home Secretary, and Lord ABERDARE has conclusively proved how important it is for a Minister to put a thoroughly efficient official at the head of the Home Department. Mr. HUNT may be trusted to be pleasant and obliging, and to do his work fairly well, but the new HOME SECRETARY has some awkward questions before him. Beer has done great things for the Conservatives, and beer will expect to have its reward; and the judgment, firmness, and tact of the HOME SECRETARY will be severely taxed if he is at once to keep the publicans in good humour, and yet to teach them that the world was not made exclusively for their benefit. Had the position of Mr. HARDY and Mr. HUNT been reversed, the chief appointments made by Mr. DISRAELI would have been beyond criticism; and it will be a matter of universal satisfaction that his health permits Lord CAIRNS to act once more as Chancellor. As to the minor appointments, Mr. DISRAELI cannot avoid disappointing many aspirants whom he might naturally wish to satisfy; but there is no fear lest the public should not be well served. The Conservative party is rich in members who may be expected to succeed beyond the average of excellence in the discharge of the duties of subordinate offices. That some of those many members should now have an opportunity of showing what they can do, and of profiting by the lessons of practical experience, is one of the many good results of the change of Ministry.

THE NEW PARLIAMENT.

THE House of Commons is now complete, and consists of 351 Conservatives and 301 Liberals. Mr. DISRAELI has therefore a majority of 50, which is quite as large a majority as any Minister can want. A few weeks ago Mr. GLADSTONE had a nominal majority of 66, and now

he is out of office with a majority of 50 against him. The character of the Conservative gain is also no less remarkable than its extent. In the last Parliament there were, at the close of the general election, 493 English members, of whom 268 were Liberals and 225 Conservatives. As Bridgwater and Beverley have been since disfranchised, there are returned to this Parliament 489 English members, of whom 296 are Conservatives and 193 are Liberals. The English constituencies have thus returned in round number seventy more Conservatives than in 1868, the boroughs returning fifty and the counties twenty more. The total number of Conservatives in the present House of Commons who represent English constituencies exceeds the total number of Liberals representing English constituencies by 103. In other words, there are three Conservatives returned by English constituencies to two Liberals. When, therefore, it is said that Mr. DISRAELI starts with a majority, it may be added—and for the purposes of many political calculations it is most important to add—that his majority, if England only is looked to, is doubly as large. In Scotland there are now 41 Liberals to 19 Conservatives. Scotland is therefore even more decidedly Liberal than England is Conservative; but the Liberalism of the Scotch constituencies now is nothing like what it was in 1868, when not a single Scotch borough returned a Conservative, and only seven Conservatives were returned by Scotch counties. Taking Great Britain as a whole, the Conservatives have 315 members as against 234 Liberals, or a Conservative majority of 81. If we turn to Ireland, we find 67 Liberals, deduction being made for the double return at Athlone, and 36 Conservatives. Of the total of 103, there are probably about 53 who have, in order to secure their elections, had to speak favourably of Home Rule, and about 30 who have been returned distinctly in the character of Home Rulers. With two exceptions, the 53 members who, under pressure or voluntarily, have connected themselves with the Home Rule movement, are all reckoned as Liberals. Thus, out of the 301 Liberals, 51, or one-sixth, are, on any question connected with Home Rule, pledged to obey the dictates of the leaders of the movement. Under a strong Conservative Government it does not make much difference whether there are or are not 51 Liberals who have obtained their seats under such circumstances. But there can be no doubt that the strength of the Conservatives in the new Parliament is beyond their permanent strength in the country. As Mr. DISRAELI truly and modestly observed, the constituencies have been guided by a wish not so much to put him in as to put Mr. GLADSTONE out. How large a reduction ought to be made in order to bring the two parties to their normal strength in Parliament it is difficult to say. But we may gain some valuable light on the point by referring once more to the elections of 1868. The Conservatives then held 131 seats for English counties; they now hold 154, and the greater part of this gain has been of a permanent kind, as was shown by the constant gains of Conservatives in the by-elections for English counties during the continuance of the last Parliament; but the counties near London may have been specially affected at the recent elections by the deep dislike entertained for Mr. GLADSTONE's Ministry. To allow for this we may perhaps take off ten, and put their permanent strength in the English counties at 144. In 1868 the English boroughs returned 216 Liberals and 94 Conservatives. They now return 160 Liberals and 142 Conservatives. Mr. GLADSTONE some little time ago owned that 1868 did not fairly represent the permanent political opinions of the English boroughs, and that the Liberal gain was accidentally large. Now the Conservative gain is, no doubt, accidentally large. Perhaps it may not be very far wrong to divide the present Conservative gain, and to take 118 as the permanent strength of the Conservatives in the English boroughs, giving them in all 262 English members. If 15 are added for Scotland and 35 for Ireland, there is a total of 312, which the present elections may be taken to show is the very lowest estimate that can be safely taken of the real Conservative strength. This leaves the Liberals 350 members, and as 50 of them would be pledged more or less to Home Rule, this permanent strength of the Liberals apart from Home Rulers is 300 as against 312 Conservatives.

These are somewhat dry details, but a general sense of the conclusion to which they lead is sure to have a very great effect on the new Parliament. It will, in the first place, be a Parliament with a new Government, whose

faults and shortcomings have yet to be revealed, which will be under the guidance of a Ministry securely seated, and supported by a compact and trustworthy majority. It will be itself ready to give more than a fair trial to the Government; it will obey its wishes and vote that it is always right whatever it may do; and it will know that the country wishes the Government to have a fair trial, that the great majority of moderate men of all parties are very glad that a Conservative Ministry has been formed, and that the Conservatives must make some very bad blunders indeed in order to throw the blunders of the late Liberal Government into the shade. In the next place, the Liberals will be in a very peculiar position. It will be not nearly as much gain to them as it usually is to an Opposition to win seats at by-elections. Let us suppose that it is true that the Conservatives now hold 296 English seats, whereas their permanent strength would only give them 262; and this is a computation designedly made as unfavourable to the Conservatives as seems in any way consistent with probability. The Liberals must win 17 seats at by-elections to put themselves where they would be according to the standard of their permanent strength, and to win 17 seats at by-elections takes a long time and very hard work. But then, when they had attained this result, they would only be in the position of having 300 on their side as against 312 Conservatives. They might get fifty more votes by forming an alliance with the Home Rulers; but if they did this, they would at the next general election infallibly lose all they had gained at by-elections, and if they did not, they would be aspiring to hold office with a virtual minority. The Louth election must have dissipated the last lingering hopes of ardent Liberals that Irish constituencies would feel gratitude for eminent services, and would respect a long and honest adherence to the general principles of the Liberal party. The Irish constituencies care for nothing whatever but gratifying their own private wishes. It all comes round to this, that the members belonging to the Liberal party now go to Westminster without anything to encourage them and stir them to exertion, with no hopes of a victory by which they can profit, and with no chance of their leaders taking office except by forfeiting their own self-respect and the support of the bulk of the party in Scotch and English constituencies. Lastly, not only have the leaders of the Liberal party almost nothing to work for except to do all they can to improve the measures of the Government, but they will assume the guidance of the Opposition under most dispiriting circumstances. Their ranks have been most terribly thinned. Mr. CARDWELL and Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE will be no longer there, and many of the minor members of the late Government have lost their seats. The list, too, of the independent Liberals so odious to Liberal Ministers, so useful to Liberal leaders in Opposition, has been cut ruthlessly down. Mr. GLADSTONE is indeed left, and a party that is led by Mr. GLADSTONE can never be insignificant. But Mr. GLADSTONE is in a position to depress beyond measure any ordinary man. He has thrown away a majority; he has ruined his faithful supporters by the rash step he took for their benefit, as he supposed, in suddenly dissolving Parliament; he has risked everything for Ireland, only to find himself treated with an ingratitude that is scarcely credible; and he, so lately the idol, as he was assured by flattering journals, of the English people, is now driven out of power because the English people ask for any other Ministry than his.

The House of Lords will meet under circumstances that have long been strange to it. The majority in the Upper House will be in harmony with the majority in the Lower, and it is thirty years since this was the case. The days of being abused, threatened, intimidated, of having their decisions overruled by summary exercises of the Prerogative, of hearing a Prime Minister say that he will think three times before he does away with them, are gone by for the Peers. They will now have to help friends, not to guard against enemies. A very large proportion, too, of the higher offices of State must necessarily be held by Peers under the new Ministry, and the Lords will feel not only that affairs are being guided as they would wish, but that they have ready and constant access to those who are really guiding them. There will, however, be an Opposition strong in ability and eminence rather perhaps than in numbers, which cannot fail to exercise a great and wholesome influence. Lord DERBY will feel that he has his equal in Lord GRANVILLE, and the CHANCELLOR will be sensible of the

advantage of working in harmony with Lord SELBORNE. To this Liberal Opposition in the Lords Mr. GLADSTONE has made some well-chosen additions. Mr. CARDWELL and Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE have served their party and their country long and well; have done many things well, and some few things very well; have held and expressed distinct opinions without violence and rashness; have lived through difficult times, and discharged difficult duties without giving offence. If a peerage is a welcome refuge or an acceptable honour to either of them, they are fairly entitled to it. Why Mr. CARDWELL, who kept his seat for Oxford, has put himself on a level with his rejected colleagues and left the House of Commons, is a question which naturally suggests itself. But he may see that the prospect of his sitting in the House of Commons as a Minister is somewhat remote, and, if he is to be in Opposition, he may naturally think that the dignity and easy hours in the House of Lords would suit him; and if a Duke is to be the new Secretary for War, he would like to defend personally in the House to which the new Secretary belongs the measure which he has worked so hard to carry out, and to see, if possible, that his labours are not made worthless and his plans spoiled. That Lord ENFIELD should go to the Upper House in his father's lifetime is natural enough, as the result of the Middlesex election must have made him disinclined to wait altogether out of the political world in the vague hope of some day regaining his seat. The peerages given to Sir THOMAS FREMANTLE and Mr. HAMMOND are scarcely connected with party politics. They are the rewards of long services, and may be accepted as a tribute to those merits of the Permanent Civil Service which the late Ministry has been accused of being inclined to overlook. They are both men of special experience and knowledge, and have been conversant with important details of administration for the best part of a long life. If they use their knowledge and experience for the benefit of the body which they are now about to join, their assistance will be welcomed and recognized by one party as much as by the other.

THE EMPERORS AT ST. PETERSBURG.

THE most resolute students of the history of Court festivities must be satiated for the time with the reports by conscientious newspaper Correspondents of the pageants of St. Petersburg and Moscow; yet before the wedding party have set forth on their travels, another illustrious guest has arrived to share the Imperial hospitalities. It is difficult to bear in mind the combinations and permutations of Royal and Imperial visits. In the course of last year the Emperor of RUSSIA, the King of ITALY, and the German EMPEROR were gorgeously entertained at Vienna, and the same potentates held separate interviews with one another at Berlin. The Emperor of AUSTRIA is now paying a return visit at St. Petersburg, and it is believed that important business will be transacted during his stay. Within two or three years great efforts have been made to terminate the long-standing estrangement between the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Governments; and the Emperor of AUSTRIA perhaps wishes formally to announce the re-establishment of friendly relations. The antagonism between the two Empires is not of modern date, nor is it exclusively due to special provocations. ALEXANDER and METTERNICH cherished towards each other a political and personal antipathy which frequently exceeded the bounds of diplomatic courtesy. During the negotiations of Vienna and long afterwards, the influence of Austria constituted a powerful impediment to Russian projects of aggrandizement; and whenever the ancient design of the dismemberment of Turkey is hereafter revived, Austrian and Hungarian statesmen will no doubt again be active in counteracting the policy of their formidable neighbour. For a few years the Emperor NICHOLAS had reason to believe that his services to the Emperor FRANCIS JOSEPH had allayed the ancient jealousy of Austria. In 1849 a Russian army suppressed the Hungarian insurrection, and in the following year the King of PRUSSIA, on the eve of a rupture, tamely succumbed to Austria at the imperious demand of the Emperor of RUSSIA. It was believed that even at that time Prince SCHWARZENBERG, then Prime Minister of Austria, proclaimed his intention of rewarding the Russian services by a display of gigantic ingratitude. The story was perhaps suggested by the subsequent realization of the menace during the Crimean war. In his attack upon

Turkey the Emperor NICHOLAS had counted on the friendship and connivance of Austria not less confidently than on the pacific tendencies of Lord ABERDEEN and Mr. GLADSTONE; and the occupation of the Danubian Principalities by Austria, which secured Turkey against a renewed Russian invasion, produced a deeper feeling of resentment than the direct hostility of France and England.

It happens that Russia and Austria have unusual facilities for inflicting on one another reciprocal annoyance; and for seventeen or eighteen years after the Peace of 1856 both Governments habitually employed to the utmost their large opportunities of mutual vexation. The modern study of ethnology has done much for potentates who desire to cultivate quarrels with their neighbours; and the mixed races of Eastern Europe contain the materials of innumerable national squabbles. Half the subjects of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy speak various Slavonic dialects; and in some provinces the Orthodox Greek Church divides spiritual supremacy with the Roman Catholic hierarchy. It consequently occurred to ingenious Russian politicians that science and national sympathy required the institution of Slavonic societies at Moscow, where members who happened to be Austrian subjects were welcomed with significant cordiality. Discontented Czechs and Servians were encouraged to court the patronage of the Emperor of RUSSIA, who was supposed to be the national chief of the entire Slavonic race. If the Austrian Government was compelled to tolerate foreign encouragement of disaffection, there was some consolation in the display of extraordinary regard for the Galician Poles. During the last insurrection in Russian Poland, while the Prussian Government sternly repressed in Posen all sympathy with Poland, the feeling of the Galicians was strongly excited against Russia, not without the sanction of the Government of Vienna. Unfortunately for Austria, the peasantry of Galicia is not of Polish, but of Ruthenian origin, and both by blood and by religion it inclines rather to Russia than to Austria. The intrigues on both sides, though they caused much inconvenience and ill-feeling, have happily not resulted in war; and since the sudden and violent disturbance of the balance of power by the events of 1870, it seems to have occurred to the two Imperial Governments that it might be as well to bring their chronic quarrel for the time to a close. All monarchies have a common enemy in democratic revolution; and the reasons which formerly combined uncongenial confederates in the Holy Alliance have not ceased to be operative. For some time past the Panslavonic enthusiasts in Russia have discontinued their patriotic agitation.

It is supposed that among the subjects of discussion between Prince GORTCHAKOFF and Count ANDRASSY will be the condition of the Roumanian Principality. It is difficult to understand the interest of Austria in relaxing still further the feudal ties which connect Roumania with the Porte. Russia, on the other hand, has long desired the establishment on the Lower Danube of a nominally independent Power which might perhaps at some future time offer facilities for encroachment on Turkey. The titular sovereign of the Principality would probably be disposed as a cadet of the House of HOHENZOLLENN to court the patronage of Germany rather than of Russia or of Austria; but Bucharest is far from Berlin, and the two adjacent Empires necessarily exercise great influence in Wallachia and Moldavia. For some unexplained reason the relations of Austria and Hungary with Turkey have lately become less friendly than in former times; while Russian diplomacy has won a remarkable triumph in obtaining the confidence of the SULTAN. It will therefore not be surprising if the interview of the EMPERORS and their Ministers at St. Petersburg is followed by some proposal for the modification of the relations between Turkey and the nominally dependent provinces. The Prince of SERVIA, as an avowed client of the Emperor ALEXANDER, will probably share any additional privileges which may be conceded to the Roumanian Government. If Russia, Austria, and Germany concur in any new arrangement, and especially if they obtain the assent of the Porte, it will be difficult for England to interfere, and France has for the present withdrawn from active participation in Eastern affairs. Lord PALMERSTON himself was unable to prevent the union of the Danubian Principalities which was promoted by NAPOLEON III. with the active Parliamentary support of Mr. GLADSTONE. In the present day political influence, like gravitation, bears an inverse ratio to distances. There is probably no foundation for a

statement which has appeared in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, that the German Government is disposed to concur with Russia in the dismemberment of Turkey. Such an enterprise, even if it could be reconciled with German interests, would involve a desperate struggle with Austria; and yet it is certain that the three Imperial Governments are at present disposed to maintain with one another friendly relations.

The general politics of the Continent will not furnish the Russian and Austrian EMPERORS with practical subjects of negotiation. Both potentates would deprecate the renewal of a struggle between France and Germany; and if a rupture unfortunately occurred, both would, as before, remain neutral. The irritable and menacing attitude of the German Government towards France is not easily to be explained. It is now asserted that the alleged Circular to the German Envoy is not a Circular, but a document of a less formal or more confidential character; but it seems to be admitted that remonstrances or warnings have been more or less directly addressed to France. Neither Russia nor Austria has any sympathy with the Ultramontane agitation which is sometimes encouraged by successive French Governments, nor, on the other hand, are they pledged to approve of Prince BISMARCK's domestic legislation. If it were necessary to take a side, Russia, and probably Austria, would incline rather to Germany than to a Power which is nominally a Republic. It is satisfactory to observe that French politicians for once abstain from indulgence in illusions as to the aid of foreign allies in possible future contests. As a judicious French writer remarks, France will have all Europe for allies as long as peace is maintained, or, in other words, as long as no allies are wanted; but during the present reign Russia will maintain close friendship with Germany; and Austria has finally acquiesced in the consequences of the decisive struggle of 1866. If it is true that the Emperor ALEXANDER designs to visit England during the present year, the cycle of Imperial progresses will be completely rounded. In this country the annualists of State ceremonies will be able to pursue their vocation undisturbed by any suspicion of diplomatic mysteries arranged by Lord DERBY in the secret precincts of Downing Street.

THE IRISH ELECTIONS.

SOME of Mr. GLADSTONE's zealous supporters candidly acknowledge that the result of the Irish elections partially reconciles them to their recent defeat. It is undoubtedly better that a body of forty or fifty members pledged to the dismemberment of the Empire should be encountered by a compact majority, than that they should be able, as in the days of O'CONNELL, to decide successive struggles between nearly equal parties. The incoming Ministers will from circumstances, if not on principle, be less inclined than their predecessors to offer partial concessions to the Separatists. Mr. DISRAELI bestowed in former times much trouble and ingenuity on the unprofitable task of conciliating the support of the Irish Roman Catholics. Having been baffled by the rash impetuosity of the late Lord DERBY, and having been afterwards outbidden by his great political rival, he has taken several occasions of announcing his determination not to renew negotiations which indeed would probably be impracticable. On the other hand, Mr. GLADSTONE, after doing much for the removal of Irish grievances, has repeatedly asserted his confident belief that his great measures would succeed in their object of allaying disaffection. In the address which announced the dissolution he tendered a trifling instalment of the demands of the Home Rule faction in the form of some projected machinery for the discussion of Irish Private Bills in Dublin. About the same time he proclaimed his inability to understand the meaning of Home Rule, with the obvious purpose of leading the Irish to suppose that some interpretation of the popular doctrine might perhaps be accepted. Even if his Government had remained in office, the elections for Tipperary, for Louth, and for other constituencies would have forced on Mr. GLADSTONE himself the conviction that compromise was impossible, though he might still have hesitated to affirm a demonstrable proposition in plain and intelligible language. A Liberal majority consisting partly of advocates of separation would have been paralysed from the opening of the new Parliament. The number of successful Home Rule candidates corresponds nearly to the calculations which had previously

been made both by the friends of the movement and by its opponents; but untoward events which have actually occurred are more impressive than vague anticipations.

The Roman Catholic clergy are perhaps even more keenly disappointed than loyal subjects of the Crown. Although they may temporarily conceal their defeat by joining the popular agitation, they cannot but feel that the coincidence of the Home Rule movement with the establishment of the Ballot has destroyed the power which they had often misused. In the Louth contest the Roman Catholic clergy, in their anxiety to disguise their failure from themselves and from their flocks, adopted the unusual course of refusing to obey their Bishop, who had declared himself in favour of Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE. Because the Home Rule candidate was certain to succeed, they were suddenly impressed with the duty of exacting adhesion to the Home Rule resolutions passed at the late meeting in Dublin. It was less possible for the priests to identify themselves with the winning cause in Limerick. During the preparatory contest which preceded the general election the Bishop and the clergy had earnestly supported the Home Rule candidate in opposition to the representative of Fenian opinions. The violence which had often been encouraged by clerical agitators was now directed against the priests; and Mr. O'SULLIVAN was returned at the head of the poll. In Tipperary the anti-English faction almost succeeded in nominally returning Mr. John MITCHELL, whose sentence for treason committed in 1848 is still in force. In common with several other leading patriots, Mr. MITCHELL directly afterwards escaped from custody at the trifling cost of a deliberate breach of parole. Having joined the Democratic party in America, he at one time acquired popularity by a speech in which he expressed his wish to become the owner of "a lot of fat 'niggers," and when abolition came into fashion he necessarily adopted the Southern cause. His Tipperary supporters are eager to proclaim their indifference to personal character and to political opinion, in comparison with the paramount merit of rebellion; nor are they sorry for the occasion of reminding the priests that the days of querulous and veiled sedition are at an end. Cardinal CULLEN, who always coupled the Fenians with the harmless Freemasons in his denunciatory Pastoral, is now fully aware that Irish agitators are not bent on securing Denominational teaching as their principal object.

It is possible that the Louth election may have conveyed to Mr. GLADSTONE's understanding some inkling of the significance of Home Rule. Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE is the highest in character and position of living Irish statesmen; he was one of Mr. GLADSTONE's most confidential colleagues; and it was well known that, after the PRIME MINISTER himself, he was the chief author of the Church Act and the Land Act. Although Mr. FORTESCUE had ceased to be Irish Secretary, he had probably been consulted on the illusory project of passing Private Bills in Dublin; and if he failed to share Mr. GLADSTONE's deliberate obtuseness as to the meaning of Home Rule, he openly professed his readiness to concede to the Roman Catholic hierarchy a large share in the control of education. No man was more personally popular in Ireland or in England; and his renewed candidature was a test whether any concession to be offered by a Liberal Government would be accepted by the Separatists as a compromise. The answer consisted in a hostile majority of nearly two to one. It is not the fault of Home Rule electors or members if they are still from habit classed in newspaper lists as belonging to the Liberal party. Their votes will no doubt be customarily given against the measures of Mr. DISRAELI and his colleagues, but they will scarcely have the opportunity of inflicting on the new Government a blow as heavy as the rejection of Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE. Even the strange declaration of Lord O'HAGAN in favour of a further confiscation of proprietary rights for the benefit of the occupiers of land has not reconciled the malecontents to the Liberal Government and its policy. The farmers hope under a native Government to accomplish projects of spoliation which no English Ministry could propose to an Imperial Parliament.

The organized disaffection of a large part of the Irish population furnishes no legitimate ground for party triumph or recrimination. Although Mr. GLADSTONE's measures gave the signal for the present agitation, the Home Rule movement was inevitable, and it would perhaps have been yet more formidable if the anomaly of the Establishment had still existed, and if small tenants had not been secured against eviction. It is still more certain that Mr. GLADSTONE's University Bill, even if it had been accepted by the Roman

Catholic hierarchy and adopted by Parliament, would neither have obviated nor postponed the clamour for separation. Although half-a-dozen English members, including Mr. COWEN of Newcastle, have at the dictation of Irish electors pledged themselves to the doctrine of Home Rule, the whole of Great Britain is unanimous in the determination to maintain the integrity of the Empire. The O'SULLIVANS and the MITCHELLS supply a conclusive answer to the transparent affectation of a desire for Federal institutions which might be compatible with the unity of the Kingdom. A score of gentlemen, some of them officers in the army, who have condescended to profess adhesion to the doctrine of Home Rule, would gladly welcome any positive assurance that the demands in which they ostensibly concur will be peremptorily rejected. As to the remainder, the Home Rulers are merely put forward by the Fenians for the purpose of avoiding a direct conflict with the law. The distinction between lukewarm Home Rulers and Separatists is so well understood that the Irish members who have taken the Repeal pledge have determined not to attempt any separate organization of their forces. Before the next election some other cry may possibly take the place of Home Rule. Mr. BUTT can assuredly not hope to attain his professed object by the consent of Parliament, and the prospects of more advanced advocates of independence were never less hopeful than at present. Irish rebels have ceased to subscribe for swords of honour to be presented to Marshal MACMAHON; and the American adventurers who were thrown out of employment by the close of the Civil War no longer hope to indulge their propensities in Ireland. If the Home Rule members have the good sense to take part in the general business of Parliament, two or three periodical motions for separation will cause little inconvenience. A secession from the House of Commons would be rather annoying than dangerous, especially as but a small minority of Irish members would be inclined to tamper with schemes of rebellion. The present Parliament at least will not tolerate the proposal of a subordinate Legislature, which would probably devote itself exclusively to the matters which might by a Federal compact be expressly excluded from its cognizance. Not a single Irish peer is prepared to take his seat in an Irish House of Lords, nor are the Protestants of Ireland prepared to acquiesce in the establishment of a Catholic Republic.

THE IMPERIALISTS AND THE SEPTENNATE.

M. ROUHER has proved himself an expert in the art of conveying a civil insult. His letter to a provincial journal which has been fined for speaking wrongly of the present form of government in France must have made the MINISTER of the INTERIOR regret that he had not left the offender alone. It is less easy to proceed against M. ROUHER than to prosecute an obscure newspaper; yet M. ROUHER's letter has done more to reanimate the Imperialists than a whole year's articles in the Clermont *Ami de l'Ordre*, and the alarm of the Government is plainly manifested in the measures directed against the proposed demonstration on the PRINCE IMPERIAL's birthday. For the future, M. ROUHER says to the editor, be more respectful to the Septennate. Had I seen the article which has got you into trouble, I should have counselled you not to publish it. The Septennate is but a poor thing, I grant, but, so far as it goes, it helps the Imperialist cause. It only professes to be a makeshift, and unforeseen events may at any moment bring it to an end. But it reserves to a future day the definitive expression of the national will, and that is exactly what the Imperialists most desire. They want time to reorganize their forces, and the present truce between parties gives them this. When the Septennate comes to an end there will be but two forms of government between which the French people will have to choose. On one side will be the Republic, on the other side the Empire; and with this alternative before them the great majority of the electors will have no hesitation in giving the preference to the Empire. In the meantime the duty of every Imperialist organ is to support the rudimentary and transient institutions which for the present are all that France possesses, and to preach the indissoluble alliance of the interests of order and democracy.

M. ROUHER may be acquitted of any timid desire to bow down in the house of RIMMON. While professing to do reverence to the Septennate, he is really doing all he can to upset it. He probably assured himself, before writing

this letter, that the Government was not strong enough to resent its publication. The fact is, as has been often pointed out, that though the Imperialists are not numerically strong in the country, they are strong in the possession of official experience, while in the Assembly the balance of parties may make their influence indispensable to the Government in any close division. The Duke of BROGLIE has to appoint new mayors all over the country, and he cannot but feel that a mayor who knows nothing of his work may make the law and the Government which passed it ridiculous instead of formidable. He knows, too, that the Extreme Right is not to be trusted, and that among the Right Centre there are some whose sympathies point towards union with the Left Centre. With these facts to deal with, he cannot act towards the Imperialists as he would probably like to act towards them if he had the power. He is obliged to put the best face he can on their insolence, and accordingly he instructs the newspapers who befriend him to treat M. ROUHER's letter as an expression of confidence in the Septennate. How far Marshal MACMAHON likes being plainly told that he is only a rather superior sort of warming-pan for the PRINCE IMPERIAL does not appear. Perhaps the Marshal only reads professional newspapers. But that the Duke of BROGLIE is trying his hardest to like it is plain. Certainly M. ROUHER knows how to make professed support a great deal more bitter than avowed enmity. Prince NAPOLEON has been writing in the newspapers as well as M. ROUHER, but his ingenuity has suggested nothing more damaging than a direct slap in the face. I can be no partisan, he says, of any Government which is not directly instituted by the people. Before the Septennate could have secured the support of those who remain faithful to the Napoleonic tradition, it must have been established by universal suffrage—the one sovereign to whom all Frenchmen can properly submit. This sort of attack does the Government no harm. It is rather a credit to it with many Republicans that it should be the object of it. But to have to sit silent under M. ROUHER's sneers, to be reduced even to put up with them as a less evil than M. ROUHER's active opposition, is a real humiliation.

The sense of this, joined to the alarm which M. ROUHER's confident predictions have naturally excited, has made both the Legitimist and the Orleanist members of the majority a little uneasy. M. DE FRANCLIEU, speaking for the Extreme Right, assures M. ROUHER that when the appointed time shall come, it will find neither Republic nor Empire, but that ancient principle of national life which is always equally powerful and comes invariably to save France when all other saviours fail—the legitimate Monarchy. If M. ROUHER is to proclaim NAPOLEON IV., and M. DE FRANCLIEU HENRY V., whenever it occurs to them to write to a newspaper, those of the Orleanists who regard the Count of CHAMBORD's letter as finally disposing of his claim to the Throne will naturally wish to have their say as well, and the old rumours of a plan for appointing the Duke of AUMALE Lieutenant-General of the kingdom are consequently beginning to revive. These are the ways of supporting Marshal MACMAHON's authority which find favour with different sections of his supporters. The Government cannot well censure one of them without censuring all, and to censure all would be to make the maintenance of the majority impossible except by conciliating the support of the Left Centre. But the support of the Left Centre is not to be had except upon condition that the Republic is recognized and consolidated, and this is a concession which the Duke of BROGLIE cannot bring himself to make. He will be compelled, therefore, in all probability, to go on in his present course and allow the Septennate to be insulted at every turn by its professed friends. This is not a policy likely to increase the respect in which it is held in the country. The majority of the electors lose no opportunity of showing that they wish for a Republic, but in most cases the Republic they desire is so Conservative in character that there might not be much difficulty in persuading them that Marshal MACMAHON's rule possesses all the necessary qualifications. But in order to impress them in this way the Government must show a firm front to its enemies. A Republic which does not claim to be permanent, which allows its adversaries to quarrel about the succession in its lifetime, which submits to be praised because it is content to smooth the way for its betters, is not a Republic which gives any promise of strength.

M. ROUHER sees this plainly, and he has very good reason for thinking that the continuance of such

a Government plays his game better than anything else could play it. If the Septennate commanded respect, or at least showed itself resolute in requiring respect, the nation might come by degrees to accept it as the established form of government, and all that would be necessary at the end of the seven years would be to make such personal changes as the retirement of Marshal MACMAHON might require. But if the Septennate is continually assailed without making any attempt to defend itself, the nation will cease to regard it as giving that security for public order which they are determined to demand of the Government. It is probable that when the country has once made up its mind that Marshal MACMAHON's Government is not capable of development into a Conservative Republic, it will simply draw the conclusion that the Conservative Republic must be organized by other hands. But it is possible that it may draw the conclusion that a Conservative Republic is an impossibility, and in that case there can be little doubt that the Empire would secure a preponderance of votes. In spite of all the associations connected with Sedan, the Empire is less unpopular than a Legitimist Restoration. Its name does not conjure up ideas of old abuses; on the contrary, down to 1870 it was chiefly identified with material prosperity. The PRINCE IMPERIAL will be eighteen next month, and long before the Septennate has come to its natural end he will be old enough to assume the Government without so much as a suggestion of any regency. He is in no way responsible for his father's errors, and his youth and inexperience will naturally help to win him friends. The Bonapartists who have been invited to do him homage at Chislehurst will return home with glowing accounts of his urbanity and talents for command; and in proportion as Frenchmen cease to see in Marshal MACMAHON a protector against Legitimacy, with its train of attendant abuses, they will learn to see one in the PRINCE IMPERIAL. This probably is M. ROUHER's calculation; and though there are many things which may come in to falsify it, there is a sufficient possibility of its proving accurate to make the Duke of BROGLIE seriously uncomfortable. It has apparently been found impossible to answer M. ROUHER directly; but the Circular of the MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR with regard to the Chislehurst gathering clearly betrays the disquietude of the Government.

EDUCATIONAL ASPECT OF THE ELECTIONS.

THE General Election which has so often been appealed to as the touchstone of the educational controversies of the last four years has left no doubt what are the negative conclusions at which the electors have arrived. They may not be very clear as to the subjects they want taught, but they have made it unmistakably evident that they do not want religion not to be taught. They may have uncertain views as to the precise relations between voluntary and School Board schools, but they have left no excuse for supposing that they wish School Board schools to have the whole field to themselves. There is no reason to suppose that the Dissenters showed the late Government any forbearance, or that they waived any chance of returning a Secular candidate in order to give a helping hand to a Cabinet in difficulties. Next to the rejection of the Prime Minister at Greenwich, no more damaging blow could have been dealt to the Government than the rejection of Mr. FORSTER at Bradford; but this reflection did not prevent the advanced Nonconformists from working their hardest to deprive him of his seat. The conspicuous success of the Minister who is the special object of Nonconformist hatred, and the defeat of the party as a whole in a great measure because it was supposed, not only by its foes, but by a large number of its friends, to be contemplating some concession to this sentiment, supply between them an answer to the League's challenge. When Mr. DIXON reviews his troops at the beginning of the Session he will find that doughty little band woefully lessened in numbers. It will be but a shadow of his former following that he will have to lead to fresh assaults upon the 25th Clause, and inspirit by fresh declarations that Britons will never learn the rudiments of secular knowledge from lips which at some other hour of the day may be polluted by Denominational formulae. If Mr. FORSTER has placed himself on a pinnacle of infamy which is only shared by JUDAS ISCARION—this pious but not original parallel is borrowed from a Dissenting minister at Rochdale—the country is so thoroughly corrupted that it has agreed to call his treachery consistency.

Yet in looking back over the history of the famous clause round which the battle has raged, it is impossible

not to be struck with its unfitness for the prominence that fortune has assigned to it. Mr. DISRAELI lately declared that the question before the country is whether national education shall be founded on the consecrated basis of religion, or whether it shall be entirely secular. "The 25th Clause," he added, in accents of solemn warning, "is the symbol of the controversy, and you must be "for it or against it." In a sense no doubt this is true. There can be no compromise with a man who feels his conscience hurt at the thought that a fraction of his contribution to the education rate may go to pay the cost, not of religious instruction, but of secular instruction in a school in which religious instruction is given at the cost of somebody else. But there is great possible inconvenience about the erection of the 25th Clause into a symbol, or a principle, or anything of that exalted kind. If the right of the parent to refuse to send his child to any school which does not give religious instruction such as he can approve of as well as secular instruction be once recognized, what will become of compulsion in country districts? In proportion as compulsion becomes the rule with School Boards, the number of cases in which parents will be forced to send their children to the one available school will increase, and in the majority of these cases this one school will virtually be a Church school. Supposing that a Dissenting parent turns round on a School Board composed entirely of Churchmen, and reminds them that their friends on the hustings and in Parliament have always proclaimed that the parent's conscience is violated if he is forced to send his child to a Secular school, they will be hard put to it to devise a justification for forcing a parent to send his child to a Denominational school. If the Conscience Clause is worth anything, it must be equally a protection to the parent's conscience in both cases. The true justification of the 25th Clause is not that it establishes the parent's right to choose his own school, but that it protects him against needless restrictions on his freedom of choice. The Education Department or the School Boards have a perfect right to forbid him to send his child to a school which he likes, or to compel him to send it to a school which he dislikes, provided that the former does not come up to an adequate standard of secular teaching, or that the latter is the only school within reach. But they have no right to interfere with him where the public interest is not concerned, and the State has certainly nothing to gain by preventing him from picking out a school for himself when there are more than one which answer to the prescribed conditions.

The practical importance of the clause being so small, it is not wonderful that Liberal politicians should have asked themselves whether it might not be quietly got out of the way. Those who said Yes to this question forgot, we think, that its accidental importance had by degrees come to be out of all proportion to its real importance. When once the Dissenters had adopted it as the key of the position, the Government were forced to view it in the same light. If Mr. FORSTER had proposed the simple repeal of the 25th Clause, it would have been taken, alike by Secularists and Denominationalists, as an intimation that he was prepared to abandon the principle of the Education Act, and to set himself in avowed antagonism to voluntary schools. The recent elections show what the result of this change of front would have been. If a mere unfounded fear that the Government were disposed to coquet with the Secularists went a long way to give the Conservatives a majority of 50, what majority would conclusive evidence that the Government were prepared to capitulate to the Secularists have given them? That is a sum in political proportion which we should like to see worked out by Mr. ILLINGWORTH. The only way in which the 25th Clause could have been satisfactorily got rid of was by making the payment of school fees a part of the ordinary machinery of poor relief. Mr. FORSTER proposed something like this last year, but he weakened his own position by maintaining an unreal distinction between one form of destitution and another, and refusing to allow money given by the community to enable a man to do his duty by his children to be called parochial relief. Apart from this, the change came too late for the purpose for which it was most immediately needed. The Dissenters had got their backs up, and they were determined to treat $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ raised to pay for a child's schooling as something altogether distinct from $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ raised to pay for a child's milk and water. They were indifferent to the terrible possibility that their money might find its way to a Denominational dairy, but they were fully alive to the not more terrible possibility that their money might find

its way to a Denominational school. If the 25th Clause had been repealed as the Education Act Amendment Bill proposed to repeal it, it is probable that not a single Dissenter would have been appeased, and consequently that not a single moderate Liberal would have been relieved of his fear that the Government would still try to appease them.

It does not follow from this that, if inability to pay the schoolmaster had in the first instance been put on a level with inability to pay the milkman, the hostility of the Dissenters to the 25th Clause would have been so violent, or that, if the two forms of destitution were even now treated as identical, their hostility might not die out. It was impossible in 1870 to foresee that a provision apparently so innocent as that which enabled School Boards to do on a small scale what the Education Department does every day on a large scale, could have contained such latent power of irritation. The late Government was not to blame, therefore, for omitting to guard against so inconceivable an outburst of impracticable prejudice. But they cannot be so easily excused for not foreseeing the mischief to which the clause might give rise in other ways. Except in Manchester, we do not know that the power given to the School Boards to pay or excuse the payment of school fees in the case of indigent parents has been much abused. But that it is open to abuse wherever a School Board is more benevolent than wise is obvious. If a parent too poor to pay for his child's schooling had been turned over to the Guardians, who know his circumstances and can estimate how far his inability is the result of destitution and how far of a natural preference for spending money in other ways, one avenue to dependence would have been closed, and a troublesome controversy would probably have been avoided. Perhaps a Conservative Government can hardly be expected to remove a stumbling block out of their opponents' path; but if they will abolish the distinction between indigence and destitution they will relieve the School Boards of a duty for which they are singularly unfitted, and provide an additional safeguard against a temptation to which, as it is, the poor are often exposed without thought and without necessity.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS AND SHIPWRECKS.

ONE of the first duties of the new President of the Board of Trade will be to consider what course he is prepared to take with regard to the prevention of loss of life on railways and at sea. The two subjects will of course have to be treated separately in actual legislation, but the general principles which should govern legislation are in each case the same. It is obvious that railway Directors stand in precisely the same relation to their passengers as shipowners to their crews, and that, if it is right that the State should interfere for the protection of the one class, it is equally bound to interfere for the protection of the other. Moreover, the kind of interference which is held to be appropriate and beneficial in the one case will probably be found to be no less applicable to the other. The principle that the State is not only entitled but bound to interpose for the protection of life in any business where it appears to be recklessly and wantonly placed in peril, is embodied in a number of Acts of Parliament dealing with different trades and occupations, and may be taken as universally acknowledged. It may also be assumed to be the general opinion that the loss of life at sea and on railways is excessive, and that a serious attempt should be made to put a stop to this shocking and disgraceful state of things. The only question is in what manner the Government can interfere so as to produce a satisfactory result. Should it interfere at the outset, and direct that no train should be allowed to start or ship to sail except under a Government certificate? Or should it wait until a disaster happens, and then come down on the persons who are accountable for it with heavy penalties? As a rule, prevention is no doubt preferable to punishment, but then everything depends on how far prevention is practicable. For the Government to interfere in a merely formal manner, without doing its work thoroughly, would be simply to do mischief. As long as the Government held aloof people would try to take care of themselves. At least they would know that, if they did not, there would be nobody else to do it for them. But when the Government assumes the responsibility of providing for the safety of the public in any way, the public is very apt to neglect precautions which it would otherwise

have taken on its own account, and to trust blindly and unreservedly to the Government. Moreover, it is impossible to extend the responsibility of the Government in this manner without at the same time diminishing the responsibility of those whose work it takes in a great measure on its own shoulders. It is obvious, for example, that in the case of a railway the Government could not undertake to guarantee the soundness of plant and permanent way, the sufficiency of the staff in numbers and capacity, or to determine the proper intervals which should be allowed between trains, without practically taking the management of the railway into its own hands; and that when once the Directors had obtained the necessary certificates, they would be free from all further responsibility. The same observation of course applies to ships. If the Government were to say that no ship should sail until it was shown to the satisfaction of its agents that the vessel was safe and sound as regards construction, materials, loading, and in other respects, it would be simply relieving the shipowners of all trouble, or, at least, of all responsibility.

It may be assumed that all reasonable and practical men are agreed that any attempt at interference to this extent would be both absurd and mischievous, and that the best course is to make the persons who have the management of railways or ships feel that, if anything goes wrong, they will be liable to suffer severely, and that it is their own interest to be careful about human life. In addition some preventive checks may be applied, but only in a subordinate way and with great caution and moderation. On this subject the policy of the Board of Trade has hitherto been tentative and experimental. A railway, for instance, is not allowed to be opened for traffic until it has been inspected and certified as safe by a Government official. When an accident occurs an Inspector is sent to report on it, and the Reports accumulate as so much waste paper on the shelves of the department. At the first the Board of Trade has certainly a hold on a Railway Company, but after the railway is once open the Company can do as it likes. The Board has no means of enforcing its recommendations or giving effect to its rebukes by punishment. It is easy to see to what the Government would stand committed if it went much further in the direction of preliminary inspection; but the system of inquiries into accidents is clearly feeble and inconclusive. Nothing can be more ridiculous than to see public officials firing off blank-cartridge Reports at the Companies, who, knowing they cannot be hit, merely laugh at the noise. If any value is to be attached to the reports of the Inspectors, they should be invested with some sort of judicial weight. What is wanted is a proper court for investigating railway accidents, which should be able to punish offenders, and to award compensation to the sufferers. A coroner's inquest is not at all adapted for an inquiry of the kind; and of course it can only deal with criminal culpability. If the inquiry were entrusted to a competent and authoritative tribunal, questions of civil damages might perhaps be settled at the same time, and the injured persons would thus be relieved from the necessity of establishing their claims by a series of costly suits. The only effectual way of bringing the Companies under control is to provide those whom they injure in any way with the means of getting at them easily, and making them pay dearly for their neglect or misconduct. It may be inferred, from the answers of the Railway Chairmen to the Circular of the Board of Trade, that nothing is to be hoped for from the voluntary action of the Companies. One Chairman indeed—Mr. ELLIS, of the Midland Company—has had the candour to admit that the dangers of railway travelling are due to the Companies attempting to do more than is in their power; and there is abundant evidence that this is true. Yet, in the face of this notorious fact, we find the Companies, as a rule, repudiating responsibility, and insisting that their present arrangements, under which accidents are of almost daily occurrence, are as near perfection as anything human can be.

In regard to ships the same general principles hold good as in regard to railways. The object of legislation should be to make shipowners very careful about the condition of their vessels, by imposing heavy penalties in cases where vessels have been sent out in an unseaworthy state. At present there is an annual survey of all British passenger steamers, and it is contended that this inspection should be extended to vessels of every class. The evidence which has been collected by the Royal Commission shows that the

better sort of shipowners take these precautions on their own behalf, and find that it is their interest to do so; but it may ultimately prove to be necessary to enforce inspections in every case. In the meantime, however, it would be at least prudent to postpone a measure of this kind, which would be costly and troublesome in its operation, until it has been seen what can be done by fastening upon the owner responsibility for the safety of his ships. That a great many vessels are lost every year simply because they are despatched in a rickety or overloaded condition has been proved beyond question. It is admitted by the Royal Commissioners, and it is also admitted by the shipowners themselves. At a recent meeting of the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce there was a discussion as to what measures should be taken with regard to unseaworthy ships, in which it was assumed without dispute that, as the Chairman said, there was "a certain class of shipowners who furnished great reasons for Mr. PLIMSOLL's 'observations'." Mr. RATHBONE pointed out that respectable shipowners suffer in purse by having to pay higher premiums of insurance to compensate for the losses caused by the carelessness or misconduct of others, while they also suffer in honour through the discredit thrown upon their business. The necessity for legislation being admitted, the only question is in what form it should be applied; and Mr. RATHBONE brought forward several plausible arguments against a universal Government survey. It would be scarcely possible to obtain a sufficient number of competent men of high character to undertake the duty; underwriters, shippers, and sailors, would be tempted to trust blindly to an uncertain security; and the owner who sent out a dangerous ship would be able to shelter himself behind the certificates he had obtained. A simpler and more practicable remedy is to be found in carrying out the principle of the Act of 1871, that a ship-owner should be held personally responsible for the consequences of any neglect or recklessness on his part. Under the Act it is a misdemeanour by fraud or criminal neglect to send an unseaworthy ship to sea; but the wording of the principal section is rather loose, and no machinery is provided for enforcing the law. This deficiency should be supplied; and measures should be taken for securing information as to the depth of hold, the amount of freeboard, and other circumstances, in the case of every vessel that leaves port. The Courts of Inquiry are also capable of improvement, and it deserves consideration whether they should not be empowered to dispose of pecuniary claims against shipowners up to a certain amount.

THE BENGAL FAMINE.

DURING the height of the Indian mutiny the British public was suddenly startled by the grave announcement that two hundred mutineers captured by General Neill, near Cawnpore, had been pardoned and released by the civil authority, Mr., now Sir John, Grant. When a praiseworthy amount of virtuous indignation had been lavished on the author of this lamentable weakness, it was discovered that there was not one syllable of truth in the matter. No such body of mutineers had been captured. No one had been pardoned. Mr. Grant had never seen or corresponded with General Neill on any subject. The telegram was a deliberate, malicious, and silly lie. Of a similar character were stories circulated about the same time of the arrival in Calcutta of batches of mutilated Englishwomen; and these fictions induced the late Lady Canning to visit every lady who came down from the Upper Provinces after the fall of Delhi, and to satisfy herself that they all had returned with their ears and noses intact. We do not say that the sensational telegrams forwarded with a view of exciting the sensibilities of the English public on the famine are to be placed in this category, nor do we deprecate the concentration of our national sympathy and intelligence on a calamity which includes such splendid provinces as Bengal and Behar. But we do think it indispensable to warn readers of the danger of being led away by curt announcements of failure here and of distress there, to condemn the highest authorities at Calcutta for inadequate arrangements or deficient provision. We have reason to know that the constant despatch of astounding telegrams, evidently sent with the object of forcing the Viceroy prematurely to show all his hand, has been emphatically condemned by intelligent public opinion on the spot, and nothing could be more unjust to rulers placed in situations of unprecedented difficulty than to found a vote of censure on their conduct without the fullest information as to their remedial measures. A languid official optimist may do a deal of harm in one way, but an independent pessimist may be the most onesided of advocates and the most misleading of guides. Some of the telegrams are no doubt correct; others convey those partial truths which are as calculated to give utterly false impressions as the most baseless fictions; and others have

been hastily interpreted in a sense directly opposed to that which the full reports warrant. We propose in this paper to give a synopsis of the means adopted or proposed by the Indian Government to stem the tide of famine, or to reduce it to a scarcity, and we begin by saying that we have condensed ample information derived from divers private sources and authenticated public documents, commencing with November and ending with the mail that has just arrived.

Just three months ago the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, with the full support and approbation of the Viceroy, laid down detailed instructions for the guidance of his officers, in a State paper by no means unworthy of his high reputation, of the impending calamity, and of the heavy responsibility weighing on himself and the Civil Service. No less than five great measures of policy were indicated. We begin with the second in the official category, as being that which has found its way into a speech on the hustings, and has challenged public attention in competition with the Straits of Malacca, the 25th Clause, and the available surplus. We mean relief works, intended to improve the country permanently, and to support the labouring classes for a time. Our readers are requested to bear in mind that India is emphatically a country of agriculture and tillage. Over a large area there are no such things as pasture lands distinct and separate from arable. There are no vast manufactories, no hives of industry, no miles of galleries beneath the earth which can divert the labour of thousands from the soil. The corn, rice, and pulse lands, and the fruit-gardens, support the labourer, assure independence to the tenant proprietors, swell the coffers of Zemindars, and reward the activity of dealers in country produce by land and water, over enormous areas and in crowded marts. But a considerable portion of the agricultural and labouring classes looks to harvest-time for employment and pay. Men who have either small holdings or none at all are glad to cut the crops of their substantial neighbours, or even migrate in considerable bodies to districts thirty, fifty, or one hundred miles off, and return home well paid and well satisfied, after a month or six weeks of absence at the close of the cold season, and before the first furrow of the new agricultural year can be turned. The failure of the best harvest in December and January has obviously deprived this part of the community of the annual market for their labour. Government, instead of feeding these men gratis, as some philanthropists seem to think it was bound to do, has very naturally availed itself largely of the unemployed and surplus labour of the country; and the repeated announcements that the relief works are "crowded" really mean that able-bodied and industrious Hindoos and Mahomedans are thronging to throw up the earth-works in innumerable village and district roads; that, in Dinaigapore alone, twenty thousand are being thus saved from idleness and indigence; that, so far from being compelled to labour, men are asking to be employed at home, so as to prevent the necessity for emigration to other provinces; that the prejudices of even "Brahmans and high caste people against working on roads and tanks are rapidly disappearing," these men having long been accustomed to handle the plough in their own fields; that workmen are fairly remunerated by wages, or by the piece, as they prefer; that in Monghyr, a class of aborigines who have become half-Hindoos have shown themselves ready and willing to do any work, to erect their own temporary huts by the roadside, and to eat anything that may be offered them; that brick kilns are being burnt, old reservoirs are emptied of refuse, and new ones are being dug; and that improvements of all kinds conducive to the present health and future profit of the community are in hundreds of places devised, begun, and carried out. We ought at once to dismiss all idea that this relief work corresponds to labour in the stoneyard of St. Pancras at seven-pence a day, or under a hard-hearted Board of Guardians, or that a "cruel labour-test" should be summarily abolished. It cannot surely be contended that it is the duty of an Indian Government, at the first pinch of scarcity, to supply food gratis to every lazy Brahmin, to every stalwart Kurmi, and to every idle Kaivert. As regards the employment of women, no such epithet as "high caste" appeared in any *Times* telegram, and we ought to insist on the strongest and most unimpeachable evidence in order to credit a loose statement that Hindoo ladies of rank, accustomed to count jewels in the zenana and to do no harder work than wait on their husbands at meal-times, have hitherto either asked for or been driven to "employment on the roads." One kind-hearted official, in order to meet the prejudices of well-born men against road-making in company with others of lower condition or caste, has actually contemplated setting apart certain works to which none but *bene nati* shall be admitted. And if women of the lower orders, with here and there a few boys, have either applied for or been allotted task-work, all we can say is, that the carrying a few baskets of earth for good pay is a far lighter burden than has been imposed, all their lives, on Lakhimoni Chandilini and Puddomani Bowa by the Oriental laws of domestic submission to a husband, or by the destitute condition to which widows are often reduced.

So much for relief works, and we wish we had space for a detail of some of those for which the Government is pledged either to advance or to provide funds. Connected with the works undertaken directly by the official departments are those carried out by the Townships and Municipalities, in aid of which loans will be made on favourable terms. These embrace schemes for the drainage or water-supply of large stations and towns, for embankments, reservoirs, and wells in villages, and for the general improvement of these hybrid aggregates of independent tenant proprietorships

and manorial privileges which, for want of a comprehensive term, we are contented to call "estates." But as yet not much has been done in this direction. Some loans for digging tanks have been asked for, and grants in aid equal to one-third of the local subscriptions have been promised. These measures, however, must be considered more as inculcating the duty of self-help in critical times than as calculated materially to contribute to the salvation of the country.

A third division of the scheme of relief consists in giving full play to the natural operations of traffic and supply. By the establishment of order and the abolition of internal custom-dues, and by fifty years of peace, the inland trade of our flourishing provinces has swelled to enormous dimensions. It would have been the most fatal error to announce that the Government intended to supersede all private enterprise and to take on itself, from the first, the supply of food to all markets and villages of Behar and Bengal. On the contrary, it is a sound policy to stimulate commercial activity by removing every restriction, by communicating ample information, and by holding out special inducements and rewards. In this view tolls on ferries and at pikes have been reduced or abolished. The East Indian Railway is invited to carry grain at half rates, the Government making good the deficiency. Zemindars, planters, speculators, and traders have been encouraged to import grain from a distance on easy loans and by advances without interest, on the condition, in the case of landholders only, that they will retail the food grains at cost price. The regular trader is permitted to sell at any figure which he can command in any market. It is probable that, as the tension increases, advantage will be taken of this liberality by Englishmen who possess indigo and silk factories, or by speculative Hindoos; and already we hear of native gentlemen and ladies of the latter laying in copious stores of food on their own account. A Co-operative Society has been started in Moorshedabad. In Rangpore five Zemindars are storing, between them, nearly 50,000 maunds of rice. In Dinaigapore 40,000 maunds will be stored by two persons. In Maldah the manager of the estates of a minor is good for 10,000, and the influential and well-managed firm of the Watsons, in Rajshahye, has undertaken to buy the same amount.

But, after all, the main question with most English readers is, what has been the action of the Government itself? And this brings us to the two last measures for the prevention of the calamity—the storage and the distribution of food for millions. Now it will be recollect that, a very few weeks ago, public indignation was excited by a statement that the Government had bought 70,000 tons of rice on its own account, independently of the efforts of private trade. And even in some well-informed papers, no sarcasm was too cutting and no censure too grave for the pitiful economy which had provided such miserable grist for so huge a mill. Perhaps it did not occur to the majority of these critics that Lord Northbrook was not bound to make the fortunes of a few dashing speculators or to disorganize the rice markets more than he could not help, by announcing in the *Calcutta Gazette* the exact tonnage of rice with which he had determined to flood the country from Burmah, Madras, and Cochin China. And it now turns out, as was all along assumed by a few experienced administrators and writers not thrown off their balance, that the Government has made arrangements for the supply of more than seven times that tonnage in regard to which we were favoured with such a series of screams and shrieks. By converting 440,000 tons into corresponding Indian weights we get an amount of one million one hundred thousand of maunds; and, assuming that this rice has been purchased or contracted for at the low figure of six shillings per maund, the Indian Exchequer is already committed to an outlay, for rice alone, of three millions of our moaey. We understand that two millions have already been paid down. It is true that the Government may eventually recoup itself by selling a portion of these purchases to private traders; but this is uncertain, while what is certain is that, for weeks and months past, the Commissioners of three divisions, who fill offices analogous to those of French Prefects, have been busily engaged in marking out centres of relief in every district and in every subdivision of a district, in erecting or hiring places for storage, and in preparing for that worst and anticipated contingency when the ruling power will have not only to transport, store, and sell the grain at fair prices, but may have to weigh it out for nothing, and perhaps cook it for the starving and helpless. Three distinct phases of the apprehended visitation have been pointedly held up to the district officers as possible, and even probable. There are to be a few large centres or storehouses for a "mild famine." These will be multiplied in number, though possibly decreased in size, if the famine spreads. And if the worst happens, "the number of relief centres will have to be largely increased, so as to be within reach of all." After this, we shall leave it to our readers to say if the Government has failed, in theory at least, to face the danger and devise the remedy. Already do we hear of *gudwans* or storehouses being hired or built at well-known stations, and at marts and obscure rural villages with odd-sounding names that would delight a philologist as being purely Hindu, purely Mahomedan, or a hybrid compound of an Aryan and a Semitic language. In Dinaigapore, Maldah, Rajshay, Patna, Gya, Moorshedabad, a large part of Bhaugulpore, Monghyr, and parts of some other districts, the grain had arrived, in no inconsiderable quantities, more than six weeks ago. It is very desirable that the real distinction between "Relief Works," which have been already commenced, and "Relief Centres," which may begin to work at any time, should be borne in mind. The works of road-

making and tank-cleaning are, as we have explained, intended to draft off the able-bodied and willing portion of the community. At the Relief Centres, whenever they may come into operation, no one will dream of exacting labour tests. The food will either be given out to respectable shopkeepers, benevolent Hindoos, and independent Englishmen, who will retail or distribute it as may be arranged, or else it will be doled out, morning and evening, by the officials themselves, to the widow, the orphan, and the religious mendicant, as well as to that considerable class of Hindoos and Mahomedans who have neither lands, nor gardens, nor lucrative trades to fall back on, but who, in the very best of seasons, live from hand to mouth on their daily earnings, own two suits of light clothing, a hookah and a brass pot, and cook, eat, and sleep in the one apartment of a thatched hut.

We have endeavoured to show that Government has assisted, promoted, and rewarded private enterprise; that it has set an example to native benevolence; that it has given employment to unoccupied native industry; and that it has by no means forgotten that its first duty may be, at any time, to keep the population alive. But after what we have been told about the progress of the famine outstripping the sluggish action of the State, it is an agreeable surprise to find that, up to the end of the third week of January, no actual cases of men dying from want of food had been discovered. Those spoken of in a telegram as having occurred in Sarun or Chuprah turn out to be ordinary deaths; and the active officers riding about the country to detect and report the first cases of starvation have been able to find nothing more serious than the following. A beggar with one arm, in a fit of pique, threatened to commit suicide. A lad was found crying because he had "nothing to eat," and was immediately relieved. A native was actually seen to suck some of his own sugar-cane; but, as the report naively adds, this could hardly be quoted as an "instance of real distress."

We do not, however, forget that famines, like conflagrations, are fearfully rapid in their progress. High prices in one week become scarcity in the next, and famine in a third. It is indisputable that a large tract lying between the left bank of the Ganges and the mountain-ranges of Nepaul is now causing anxiety at headquarters, and that all the tried abilities of Sir Richard Temple and his staff are taxed to pour food and grain into Northern Tirhoot, into Chumparun, a district owned, like the county of Sutherland, almost by one huge proprietor, the Bettia Raja, and into parts of Sarun and of Bhaugulpore. This area is some way from the river, and is not pierced by any rail. But the country has many fair-weather roads, and is very easily traversed at this season. The population is not dependent on rice, but can eat wheat, the coarser cereals, and the various pulses, which can be supplied in ample quantities from Hindostan proper and the Punjab. The worst time is, however, yet to come. By the middle or end of March the cold weather crops will be ripe, and most of them cut and carried. And there must come a period of great anxiety and expectation before the first spring showers of April and May, which precede the periodical rains of June, and admit of the commencement of agricultural operations. Even if the early rain is favourable, no further crop can be reaped, under any possibility, till the beginning or middle of August. We have therefore yet six months of extreme tension. It is next to impossible that in this limit of time deaths should not occur from weakness, from diseases induced by low living, and from sheer want of food. Besides the large class which supports itself by labour, and not by rents and profits, there are endless varieties of mendicant Brahmins, hedge priests, Bushums, Bairages, and Faquires whose lives are spent in wandering over the country and in seeking alms. The Government cannot be deputing its officials to run after these men, or see that they do not faint on their travels or are not driven away by villagers of different castes and antagonistic feelings; nor can it do more than place food as near as possible to towns and populous villages. Perhaps those who threaten Lord Northbrook with impeachment if a single life is sacrificed will just take the trouble to send for any Poor Law Report and ascertain for themselves, not how many souls died during the Irish famine, but how many perished in London in one twelvemonth within half-an-hour's reach of Boards and Relieving Officers, of benevolence with money in both its pockets, and of a press that never nods. After all that has been said about prohibiting exports and insufficient supply, we have reason for believing that abundant supplies will have been retained in or attracted to the country, and that the one great problem will be how to get them up to the masses. But in any view of the case, while it is the part of the press to concentrate the scattered rays of public opinion into one focus on this solemn topic, it is also its duty to abstain from condemning such eminent public servants as Lord Northbrook, his whole Council, and the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, till we all have before us some particulars which might have been made public long ago. When the records "leap to light," it will be time enough to say whether our Indian statesmen shall or shall not be shamed.

THE MISSION.

THE Mission which began on Sunday week and ended last Tuesday night with advantage have been exempted from newspaper controversy. But it is one of the conditions of an Established Church that it can do nothing in a corner. The

Roman Catholics, we believe, hold similar exercises every year, and among some of the Dissenting sects they are almost perennial; but when a Mission is begun and ended in St. Paul's Cathedral, it falls at once within the range of descriptive reporting, Special Correspondents, and leading articles. Those who would willingly have let it pass without comment are forced therefore to follow suit, if it be only to point out the narrowness and the ignorance of much that has been written on the subject.

The first remark which suggestss itself is so obvious that there would be no need to make it if it were not constantly ignored alike by the friends and the enemies of the Mission. The desire to hold a Mission at all is tantamount to a confession of at least partial failure. Extraordinary machinery is not called in until the ordinary machinery is supposed to have proved insufficient for the work to be done. The exultation with which the Mission has been hailed by many excellent persons resembles the joy which invalids sometimes show when they are ordered to take strong medicines; "Nothing short of calomel will do for me," says the patient proudly, and for the moment he seems really raised a step or two in the hierarchy of moral beings by the self-conscious possession of a peculiarly aggravated disorder. In theory an Established Church with a complete parochial system has no business to need a Mission. Its ordinary organization is professedly designed to leave no room for such exceptional raids upon sin and unbelief. The whole country is parcelled out amongst the clergy to the intent that this sort of warfare should be regular and uninterrupted. Roman Catholics or Dissenters stand in this respect in a different position from members of the Church of England. Their religious organizations are not coextensive with the population; they are minorities whose aim it is to make an impression upon the alien majority around them. But the Church of England has had either the exclusive or the predominant control of the spiritual interests of Englishmen for centuries, and to say that a Mission is wanted is to admit that this control has not been turned to the best account. On the other hand, it may fairly be contended that, as the Church of England has allowed a large portion of the population to get beyond the influence of religion, there is now no alternative open to her but either to make no effort to recall them, or to resort to means which are more or less alien from the temper of her ordinary action. It is no conclusive argument to say that, wherever there is a church and a clergyman, there a Mission in the true sense of the term is perpetually going on, or that Lent and Advent, and every Sunday as it comes round, are so many stimulants to the flagging energy of Christian people. The advocates of the Mission have an answer ready. In every great town at all events there are thousands and tens of thousands who never enter a church, who have no acquaintance with the ecclesiastical seasons, who make no difference between Sunday and week-day, except that on the Sunday they spend more time in the public-house. These are not the mere black sheep of the parish, the recognized members of a criminal or semi-criminal class; they are persons who, except as regards religion, do not differ greatly from the church-going, Sunday-keeping population among which they live. But in the matter of religion they have somehow stepped out of knowledge. If they are to be brought within knowledge once more, it must be by a new agency of some sort. The mere fact that churches are standing all around will effect nothing. The sight of the heaven-pointing spire, and the open door, and all the rest of it, is perfectly familiar to them already, and is not in the least suggestive to them of going inside. And supposing they did go inside, is it certain that they would be much the better for it? The ordinary services of the Church of England are not specially adapted for persons who have all their religion to learn. They presuppose a religious childhood and youth, some familiarity with sacred books and doctrines, an intelligent appreciation of sacred ceremonies. No doubt the Anglican service is decent and orderly, and appeals rather to the reason than to the emotions. But its possession of these qualities is no passport to the affection of persons who think its decency dullness, and who, if open to religious appeals at all, are only open to them through those very emotions of which the Prayer Book makes cautious and sparing use. Whether a Mission does any lasting good to the class in question is a point which it is very difficult to determine. But uncertainty on this head is quite consistent with the admission that no other agency is likely to do them even passing good.

This reasoning goes far towards disposing of Mr. Harry Jones's complaint that the Mission is "out of harmony with the pastoral system of the Church of England," and is likely, if successful, to produce "an undesirable type of religion." The rector of St. George's-in-the-East ought to know as well as most men that there is a vast region within which the pastoral system of the Church of England has practically no existence, and that as regards the dwellers in this region the choice is not between a desirable and an undesirable type of religion, but between religion and no religion. Mr. Harry Jones is probably not prepared to maintain that unless religion can be had of the precise type which he himself likes, it had better be dispensed with altogether. What he says may be applicable to persons who are already under religious influence, and to Missionaries whose object is to win these persons over to more complete acceptance of clerical authority and a blinder reliance upon clerical guidance; but it is not applicable to persons who at present are under no religious influence whatever, and as to whom, therefore, at all events from a clerical point of view, it is a clear gain that they should be brought even under "the continuous

direction of a parson or a priest." Some sensible remarks on this aspect of the Mission are made by a "West End Incumbent," whose letter was published in the *Times* of Saturday last. Granting, he says, that the Mission in the hands of some of the Ritualists aims at bringing people to confession, and that confession is, as he himself holds it to be, "unscriptural and unfeeling," still "the Ritualism which resorts to confession is at any rate more likely to be a sincere and true thing than that in which seeing and hearing are all in all; and sincerity, earnestness, and truthfulness are qualities worth eliciting and implanting, even at the cost of having to tolerate what we do not like in the forms and fashions of their manifestations." If this is true where the choice lies between sincere Ritualism and sham Ritualism, it must be equally true where the choice lies between sincere Ritualism and no religion at all. The objection that "to try to alter a religion worthy of the name is to try to alter a man's character" ignores numberless instances in which a man's religion, and his character with it, does undergo a sudden and incomprehensible change; but if it were true in itself, it would be open to the same answer. The persons to whom the Mission is primarily addressed are persons who have no religion to alter. The worst that can befall the Missioner is failure in his attempt to give them one.

What may be called a favourable estimate of the Mission as regards its main purpose is perfectly compatible with disapproval of particular methods of conducting it. To say that any religion is better than none is not the same thing as saying that one religion is as good as another. The man who disapproves confession or revivalism will not cease to disapprove them because they form part of the Mission machinery. But he may do this without denying that, if either confession or revivalism can save men and women from living and dying like the brutes, the mischiefs attributed to it may well be forgotten in the good which it effects. Still it is important to bear in mind that the intentional introduction of excitement into religion is open to grave question, and that even on the most favourable estimate of it it is a weapon singularly liable to abuse. If this is admitted, there are three features in the London Mission of 1874 which will hardly stand the test of calm examination. The first is its attempted universality. When exciting services have to be kept up in a great number of churches at the same time, it is impossible to choose the clergy who conduct them with as much care as if only a few such services were being held. Now upon this careful choice the immunity of the Mission from the bad side of religious excitement largely depends. The "after meetings" of last week are open to criticism, even if it be conceded that those who had the management of them were always men of prudence and self-control. But if these qualifications were absent—and it is strange if in the case of the younger and more enthusiastic Missioners they were not sometimes absent—the risk would be very much greater. It is a further drawback to a Mission which is going on at the same time all over London that it provokes a kind of rivalry between different churches in the amount of excitement provided. No man likes to have his services set down as slow, and in labouring to avoid this charge the bounds of good sense and calm calculation of consequences may easily be overstepped. A second objection is the want of any clear understanding as to the class to which the Mission was addressed. That persons ordinarily beyond the reach of religious teaching should be brought within it by a special effort, in the hope that when the strain is relaxed some traces of the effects may be left behind, is one thing; that persons ordinarily subjected to religious teaching should be subjected annually or biennially to special emotional influences is quite another. It is certainly not a thing to be desired that a Mission, with its accompaniments of "after meetings" and personal appeals, should become part of the ordinary ecclesiastical machinery and be applied to every congregation as a matter of course. A man just saved from drowning may be all the better for a glass of brandy, but if he takes to dram-drinking as a remedy for languid circulation, his health will get worse instead of better. The third objection is the seeming absence of any distinction between the application of excitement to a class which is not usually subject to it in any form, and its application to a class which is completely habituated to it, and that at a time when this customary excitement is at its height. The working men or women whose lives are absorbed in a dull routine of petty cares may be raised out of themselves by the attack of the Missioner, and may profit by the sudden rush of unaccustomed emotion. But where the persons appealed to live in a condition of recurrent excitement a different course ought to be pursued. We have no wish to speak harshly of such services as those which were held nightly at St. Peter's, Great Windmill Street. They were prompted by a natural desire not to leave out of the scope of the Mission a class which certainly needs it as much as any, and, as far as intentions go, those who organized them deserve every praise. But in so far as these services were founded on the hope that emotions as far removed as possible from religion might be changed into religious emotion by the mere transfer of the subject of them from the lightened casino to the darkened church, or that religious impressions begun under such associations would be likely to have any lasting influence, they seem to have been a striking instance of misdirected zeal. If the class addressed is to be caught at all, it must be singly, not in crowds, in the inevitable depression of the morning, not in the midnight excitement with which it is already but too familiar.

HIGHLAND CONSTITUENCIES.

THERE used to be plenty of animation in a close contest in a great city constituency, when party passions ran high and neither of the candidates took their stand pharisaically upon extreme purity of election; when every public-house was converted into a committee-room whose doors stood open night and day; when the grimest streets were brightened up with brilliant displays of bunting; when respectable citizens and unenfranchised ragamuffins flaunted alike in the colours of the parties; when the walls blazed with variegated posters covered with election squibs; when bills steeped in party venom were scattered broadcast; when either side had its battalions of mercenaries always eager for the fray. Still, animated as those contests were, they could scarcely be said to be romantic. There was little of romance in the exchange of savage blows and foul abuse with which the rival mobs imitated the frank personalities of their betters; there was little of romance in broken heads and streaming blood, and drunken partisans staggering along the pavements and reeling into the gutters. And, whether they were romantic or the reverse, those urban contests have now become things of the past. Now that men vote on the sly, there is very little use in trying to influence them. Committees have taken to sitting in school-rooms in place of beer-shops, and the public-houses are compelled to shut up at ridiculously early hours. There are few means of getting up the steam, or stirring the blood to fever-heat. Candidates steer clear of the old personalities, and observe the distant courtesy of dignified enemies. Their immediate supporters imitate their example, and if the masses do not as yet fully acknowledge the responsibilities of their new privileges, at least they have made some progress towards a well-bred indifference of demeanour.

The romance of the old elections was chiefly to be found in the outlying districts of those sister kingdoms which have been forced to keep house with England whether they like it or not. There was much genuine feeling in a faction fight in one of the ancient principalities of the Hibernian Kinglets, or in a borough where the influence of the popular Church clashed with that of a domineering aristocracy of aliens. The Church blessed the banners for the holy war, and the priests at the chapel doors splashed holy water over the faithful. The peasantry and squatters in outlying baronies came trooping in over moss and mountain. To do them justice, they were but little influenced by sordid considerations, although notes and sovereigns might be flying about. They swallowed down drink after a fashion that would have made the Saxon of the city gasp; but the potheem came into play as a mere incidental stimulant. They cracked each other's skulls with shillelaghs either from the most holy and conscientious motives, or from the sheer love of sport. If one of them chanced to be trodden to death under the heavy boot-heels of his enemies, he fell a martyr to his Church or his clanship, and was as sure of Paradise as any green-turbaned descendant of the Prophet who fell in combat with the infidel. Ireland is a very different country from Scotland; and as the Irish Celt attends to his religion and his business, his politics and his pleasures, in a very different way from his Scottish cousin, so the romance of elections in the Scottish Highlands is of a very different nature from that of an election in Galway or Tipperary. Still, without going into minute distinctions, we may observe that elections in the Highlands are pretty sure to preserve their romantic aspect uninfluenced by the course of Radical legislation. You may give a vote to every child of either sex who is able to put a mark on a voting-paper; but nature is impracticable beyond certain limits, and refuses to be reformed beyond a certain point. The sterility of the country and the savageness of the scenery take a great Highland election out of the commonplace category of ordinary political contests. There is no concentrating the sensation in the market square of a county town; for the county town lies almost as remote as Edinburgh or London from the everyday life of most of the natives. The distances are so enormous and the difficulties of communication so great that they paralyse the ordinary machinery of a canvass. Thought may work more surely and safely, but it takes a long time to set it in motion. The leading Liberal journal of Scotland observed the other day that the member for Inverness-shire would certainly have lost his seat had the Liberals had time to organize an opposition. The *Scotsman* may have been right or wrong in the particular case, but there can be no question that it was right in principle. Had Mr. Cameron been far less popular than he is, his opponents could never have unseated him on short notice. And as it is in Inverness-shire so it is in Perthshire, although in a smaller degree. Perthshire is simply big; it is not broken up by broad lochs and treacherous estuaries, and it does not, like Inverness and Argyll, include distant islands among the rollers of the Atlantic. Yet even Perthshire would scarcely have changed its representative last week if the name of the successful candidate had not been a household word in all the districts of the county.

The constituents in those counties have characteristics as distinctive as the counties themselves. It is easy to plumb the shallow political intelligence of the quick-witted artisan who has educated himself with his greasy paper over his pot of beer, and who has just learned sufficient to be sure that there can only be a single side to a question. But it is not so easy to fathom the mind of the man who thinks seriously although he thinks slowly and seldom, and who has lived the best of his days like a hermit, beyond the range of all external influences. Look at the lives led by the outlying electors of Inverness-shire. Many of them are shepherds and

keepers; they inhabit an isolated cottage in some remote glen, a cottage that is only approached by some faint sheep track. The nearest neighbours on one side are beyond a great mountain range; while for miles upon miles on the other there stretch the unpeopled solitudes of a deer forest. The nearest carriage road is eight miles off, and that is only travelled three days in the week by a mail-cart that carries passengers. The church and school are at twice the distance, so the children must trust to the parents for their education, and the father can only occasionally join in the Sunday gossip in the parish churchyard that expands the ideas of some of his fellow-parishioners. His cottage is ten miles from the nearest hovel where they sell whisky; not altogether an unmixed good to him, for, although it may be all the better for his purse and constitution, he misses another means of social enlightenment. His work is arduous; he is afoot among his sheep from the early morning until the dusk. By that time he is weary enough to be ready for bed immediately after supper, even did he care to afford himself candles to read by. At the best of times, and in the height of the summer, it is but seldom that a stray copy of the county paper finds its way to the head of the glen. In the winter snow-storms he is almost as absolutely out of the world as the crew of some Arctic discovery ship that has been laid up in an ice-dock in Melville Bay. The man has very possibly had fair schooling in his boyhood. More likely than not, he comes from somewhere on the Southern border, so that English is his native tongue, and consequently he can read the papers fluently, although he may not be quick to take in the sense. He is thoughtful by nature, as you may see in his face, which has much the same puzzled intelligence of expression that you remark in the venerable ram of his flock. No doubt he thinks much after a fashion of his own, as he goes "daunting" about after his straggling sheep, or stretches himself to bask in the hot sunshine, while he leaves his colties to look after his charge. But what ideas can he have formed on the great questions that affect the fate of Ministries? what views has he arrived at with regard to the extension of the suffrage in counties, or the distribution of the surplus revenue which Mr. Gladstone takes credit for accumulating? He has not even local interests, however confined, to concern himself about; for the only local rate he is interested in is the tax which limits the number of his four-footed aides-de-camp, and that dog-tax affects his master in the first place. But, whatever his ideas may be, he is pretty certain to cling to them with a constancy proportioned to the time he has bestowed in thinking them out. Theoretically, it is likely enough that he may be a Liberal; but practically he is a tolerably staunch Conservative—that is to say, he never in his life did anything in a hurry, and he is not going to decide to turn out the sitting member on a suggestion made on the spur of the moment. Such as he is, he may be assumed to be an advanced thinker and to have sound information on contemporary politics in comparison with many of his fellow-voters. At all events he talks and reads English, and, as we have said, his cottage is no more than eight mountain miles from a high road. Many of his independent fellow-electors, on the other hand, "have no Sassenach" whatever, and, as there are no Celtic journals in circulation, they can have no opportunity of informing themselves on public affairs. Many of them prefer the old religion, which takes no especial trouble to enlighten them. Many of them, again, live in scarcely accessible islands, where the arrival of intelligence from the capital and the outer world depends on the winds and tides, and the precarious movement of sailing craft.

Only conceive the labour of canvassing such a constituency, even under the most favourable circumstances. Imagine canvassing it in the depths of winter, when the gentlemen who aspire to represent it are hard pressed for time. You have to post long distances in dogcarts, seeking relays at the widely separated inns, where the stable establishments are kept on a peace footing except during the tourist season. The roads are carried along in the depths of glens where the snow-drifts gather in heavy masses. They are carried across formidable ferries, where, if you bribe the boatmen to imprudence, your business being urgent, you are not unlikely to meet the fate of Lord Ullin's daughter. So much for what is called the mainland. But if you canvass the voters on the shores of the mainland lochs, you are committed to canvassing the islands too; for there is nothing about which an islander feels more sensitively than the insinuation that his home lies out of the world. That island canvas means chartering some crank little screw; beating out into the fog among the swells and the breakers; taking flying shots at low reefs of inhabited rock, enveloped in mists and unprovided with lighthouses. Landing-places are almost as scarce as light-towers, and you may have to bob about under the "lee of the land," in impatient expectation of establishing communications with it. When you do get to shore, you must be hospitably feted by the minister and the schoolmaster, the doctor and the principal tacksmen, until, what with sea squeamishness and the strong spirits, it becomes simply heroic to preserve the charm of your manners. Moreover, you had much better not make your visit at all than cut it uncivily short. Our friend the shepherd may have made up his mind to support you; but you may rely upon it that he will promise nothing until you have set yourself down for a solemn "crack" with him. And all through the interview you sit on thorns, knowing how much has to be done before night, and how far removed you are from your sleeping-quarters. Nor does the romance by any means come to an end with the canvass. The people may be slow to promise, but they are just the men to keep the promises they have made. It is a point of honour and duty,

and it must be a grave danger indeed that will prevent them from recording their votes. So, on the great day of the poll, you have some thousands of them heading for the various polling-booths in resolute defiance of obstacles interposed by topography and climate. They climb over mountains and plod over snow-fields, wade mountain-streams, navigate lochs in crank cobles, and cross raging estuaries in rickety flat-bottomed ferry-boats; so that, should the winds and the weather interfere too seriously with the exercise of the electors' political rights, the polling of a great Highland constituency may possibly have a gloomily dramatic finale.

ECCLESIASTICAL GEOGRAPHY.

THE events of the last two or three years have made the names of German Bishops more familiar to us than usual. Some German Archbishop or Bishop is always doing something which gets not only into the German, but into the English, newspapers. A little time back they were most commonly disliking and accepting new theological dogmas; now we commonly hear of them as falling between the fangs of the civil power, and finding their way to prison for some breach of laws a little stricter than the Constitutions of Clarendon. Our German friends tell us that it is now all "Hie Wel": *hie Waibling*, and imply that "*Waibling*" is the right thing to shout. We do not doubt that it is; still we cannot wholly choke a charitable wish to let some crumbs from our table fall to the *Welfen*. It has been ingeniously suggested, in answer to a rationalizing question what became of the wolf's own cubs when she suckled Romulus and Remus, that those *Welfen* became the parents of all later *Welfen*. Shut out from their natural home and their natural nourishment, they took to a way of yelping and howling at their supplacers on the Palatine, and at everything which has in later times kept any shred or survival of power or titles sprung from that first wrong. In their case the habit must be looked on as at least pardonable, and we might be tempted to extend some measure of the same pardon to those who in what, by a certain flight of historical imagination, we may call the same cause, are just now being fined and sent to prison. In the abstract we cannot approve of anybody breaking the law, but we feel a little mercy when the law would almost seem to have been made on purpose to tempt people to break it. But after this slight outpouring we will try to improve the occasion in quite another way. The struggle—"si rixa est, ubi tu pulsas, ego vapulo tantum"—which is now going on brings forcibly to the mind some differences in one aspect of the history of three of the great countries of Europe. The chief criminal or martyr just now is an Archbishop of Posen with a hard name, which we have no Slavonic scholar at our elbow to teach us how to spell in the most correct way. Now the fact which strikes us as remarkable is that there should be such a thing as an Archbishop of Posen at all. The fact that there is an Archbishop of Posen marks something in the history of Germany—for we must count Prussian Poland as having for our purpose become part of Germany—which is unlike the history of either France or England. There is nothing in France or in England at all answering to an Archbishop of Posen, unless indeed it be the quasi-archbishopric of Westminster. When some years back, at the other end of the Prussian dominions, an Archbishop of Köln also underwent a kind of martyrdom, the description was quite familiar. Bating the years of general confusion, there had always been Archbishops of Köln from a time that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. But to any one familiar with the older ecclesiastical geography, an Archbishop of Posen seems something altogether strange. We ask at once what has become of the primatial see of Poland, the see whose Archbishops crowned the King when he was elected, and themselves held more than kingly power in the time between the death of one King and the election of another. How has the Suffragan of Posen supplanted his Metropolitan at Gnesen? We look to our *Potthast*, our *Wegweiser*, our trusty guide in these matters, and we find that Gnesen does in a manner still go on, that Gnesen and Posen are joined in some mysterious way, and that the Primate is strictly Archbishop of Gnesen-Posen, as we have heard of Princes of Sleswick-Holstein. But he is certainly best known to the world as Archbishop of Posen; the archiepiscopal residence is at Posen, Gnesen being cut down to being the dwelling-place of a *Weibbischof*. If therefore Gnesen has not utterly vanished, it has at least had a suffragan very largely to knock under to Posen. When we go further afield through the German Empire, we find many other strange episcopal phenomena. We have heard a good deal lately of the bishopric of Fulda, which sounds strange in ears which best know Fulda as the greatest of abbeys; still Fulda became a bishopric before the general return to chaos, and its promotion, if promotion it is to be reckoned, answers to the promotion of Ely under one Henry and of Peterborough under another. But, as we go on, we shall come across personages much more strange than a Bishop of Fulda. We are startled by hearing of an Archbishop of Freiburg and an Archbishop of München. Again we find that München, modern as it sounds, has something ancient tacked on to it, in the form of the ancient see of Freising, the see of the famous Otto, the historian of his imperial nephew. But as Otto never wore the pallium nor bore the cross, an Archbishop of Freising pure and simple would seem only one degree less wonderful than an Archbishop of München-Freising. The noble Minster of Limburg on the Lahn might seem well

worthy of its promotion; still its episcopal rank dates only from a Bull of 1821. And if some places have risen others have fallen; we have known men from lands and churches not specially marked for devotion towards prelacy moved almost to tears at finding that the metropolis of Germany was shorn of its honours—that primatial Mainz had sunk to a simple bishopric.

Now there is nothing like this in England or in France. Canterbury and York still keep their ancient honours. Lyons is still the seat of the Primate of all the Gauls, and Rouen of the lowlier Primate of Normandy. The Metropolitan, not of Gaul or of Normandy, but of France, is still at Rheims, ready doubtless to crown a King whenever a King shall come to be crowned. In short, the ecclesiastical geography of Germany has gone through changes to which England and France supply no parallels. The French diocesan arrangements are the most ancient of all. It is wonderful how little they have changed from the very earliest times. The only changes which they have gone through have been the comparatively easy and harmless changes of simple division and simple union. In the fourteenth century several of the provinces and dioceses of Southern Gaul were divided. Several new bishoprics were founded, several old bishoprics were raised into archbishoprics. In the seventeenth century the province of Sens was divided, and Paris, already for some years the temporal capital, was raised to the rank of an ecclesiastical metropolis. By the Concordat at the beginning of this century a number of sees were suppressed, and their dioceses united to others. But all this has been simple division and union. From the days of St. Martin till now there has been hardly any chopping and changing. There have been very few cases of the removal of a see from one city to another. There have been very few cases of the formation of a diocese out of scraps of two or three others. A French episcopal city has commonly always been an episcopal city; its diocese still commonly represents the extent of the civil jurisdiction of that city in Roman times; or, if a neighbouring see has been suppressed, its diocese represents the extent of jurisdiction of two Roman cities thrown into one. Ages back, by one of the rare exceptions, the see of St. Lo was moved to Coutances, and by modern arrangements the dioceses of Coutances and Avranches have been thrown into one. This is in France a large amount of change; but it is a trifle to such a change as the creation of an archbishopric of Freiburg, with a diocese made up out of scraps of the dioceses of Constance, Basel, Mainz, Speier, Strassburg, Worms, and Wurzburg; and it is a small amount of change compared with what most English dioceses have gone through. While such a change as that from St. Lo to Coutances is the exception in France, it has been rather the rule in England. A large number of our bishoprics changed their seats twice or thrice before they settled down where they are now. In their present form our episcopal sees mainly represent an arrangement of the eleventh century. Since then, two new bishoprics were added in the twelfth century, and six—permanently five—in the sixteenth. Of the creations of the first Henry, the diocese of Carlisle represents a territory then lately added to England; that of Ely was a simple division of Lincoln. The foundations of Henry the Eighth carried with them a certain amount of chopping and changing, as in the cases of Bristol and Chester; still simple division may be said to be the rule. The changes of our own day have united an utter contempt for the historical boundaries of dioceses with an almost superstitious reverence for the seats and titles of their Bishops. We have founded two new bishoprics after the precedents of the two Henrys; we have actually suppressed none, though Gloucester and Bristol have now but one Bishop. The head of Bristol, the city, has been joined to Gloucester, while its body, the county of Dorset, the ancient diocese of Sherborne, has been joined back again to Salisbury. In the way of chopping and changing we have creations so amazing historically as the present diocese of Oxford, and so amazing both historically and practically as the present diocese of Rochester. In this last case we get the highest development of reverence for the ancient see combined with contempt for the ancient diocese. Rather than change the title and seat of the Bishop, the see is placed on one side of an estuary and the diocese on the other. The Bishop must live away either from his see or from the bulk of his diocese. To get from one to the other, he must go through the diocese of another Bishop.

In France then we may say that the old arrangements have been, as compared with either of the other two countries, left undisturbed. In England we may say that the arrangements have been changed over and over again, and that the last change has consisted in upsetting things while keeping their names. In Germany there has been a clean sweep. In a large part at least of the country the old arrangements have been swept away, and new ones have been made with very little reference to them—new arrangements which, when they happen to agree with the old ones, do so almost accidentally. Now what are the causes for these differences between the ecclesiastical arrangements of the three nations? They lie in the distinctive features of their history. In Gaul the bishoprics were placed from the beginning in the chief town of each district, and what was the chief town of each district in the days of St. Martin is commonly the chief town in the district still. In England most of the ancient bishoprics were bishoprics of tribes rather than of cities. In the eleventh century their seats were systematically moved to the largest towns, but, unlike the cities of France, what were the largest towns then are very commonly not the largest towns now, and the systematic removal of the eleventh century has never been imitated since. Both France and England, however, could make their ecclesiastical

arrangements just as they pleased, as a domestic concern within the bounds of a single kingdom. But while France and England have been in different ways getting more and more united, Germany was till quite lately getting more and more disunited. In France and England every Bishop was a subject of the same King. In Germany the Bishops themselves became princes, and their dioceses might be at any degree of cross purposes with the territories of other princes. In a great part of Germany the old bishoprics were altogether swept away in the revolutionary time; the present sees, even if fixed in the same places, must be looked on as new creations. In Germany the whole thing has been reconstructed according to real or supposed modern convenience; and this has involved an almost utter sweeping away of the ancient arrangements. In France modern convenience has allowed the ancient arrangements to remain with what, as compared with Germany, are but slight changes. In England, after the bold change of the eleventh century, we have made a series of compromises, trying somewhat awkwardly to combine present convenience with reverence for the past. The result has been in one age a diocese consisting of the city of Bristol and county of Dorset, in another age a diocese of Rochester of which St. Albans forms a part.

In all this we have spoken roughly and generally; it would be easy to find exceptions in all these cases where some particular cause has affected some particular cities or districts. But we think that the main facts of the case will be found to bear out the broad distinctions which we have drawn between the history of the ecclesiastical geography of the three countries.

THE PANTHEONIC:

THE Pantheon was built with a view to security against fire, and not only has it perished, but it exposed the district in which it stood to the danger of general conflagration. It had retained, among many imitations, its original reputation of being "the largest, the safest, and the most fireproof warehouse in the metropolis." It became the receptacle during some months of the year of the most valuable part of the contents of many of the houses of the nobility and others whose residence in town depends on the Parliamentary Session. Thus on Friday in last week the building was completely filled with property of all kinds, of a value which only the owners themselves could estimate. The area of the building was not much less than two acres. It was built in 1830, and when finished was said to be the most complete thing of the kind ever constructed. By means of peculiarly formed and solid iron pillars a complete iron support was produced from the ground through the intervening floors to the roof. The whole of the ceilings were lathed with iron rods and covered with a composition which, as was hoped, would resist the fiercest fire, and would not crack or fall down if water was thrown upon it while hot. The boarded floors were covered with iron plates laid upon patent felt, to preserve the under side of the iron from rust and to deaden the sound. The rooms were separated from each other by brick walls and wrought-iron doors, and the stairs were all of stone. All the chimney flues were lined with cast iron, and there was not a piece of wood exposed in any part of the building. Many hundreds of tons of iron were used in its erection. These particulars have been extracted by the *Times* from its own account of the opening of the Pantheon, and they show that a belief prevailed forty years ago in iron as a protection against fire. This belief had been lamentably shaken, and it has probably perished in the ruin of the Pantheon. The danger of collecting a vast quantity of inflammable goods in a single building far outweighs the security derived from any precautions which skill or wealth can adopt in construction. At four different points an iron wall was built across the entire width of the building, from east to west, the theory being that in case of fire the communicating doors could be shut, the progress of the fire stopped, and the damage confined to a portion of the building. It is to be lamented that this theory has not held good in practice. These compartments were divided into warehouses, and these again into blocks or rooms, each of which had thick iron walls and doors, and was, or was supposed to be, entirely isolated from the rest. The renters of these rooms had keys, and, as they and the proprietors of the building believed, their goods ran as little risk from fire as from theft. Except in the offices at the entrance, there was not a gaslight on the premises. The building was, as a rule, closed at dusk, and the only lights allowed afterwards were safety-lamps. There were water-tanks and hose in the building, but no hydrants.

Such was the Pantheon, and an opinion had come to be received that property was safe in it. We are told that some of the London bankers rented strong rooms there for the deposit of deeds and plate, although it is not easy to see why this building should be more safe than a properly constructed bank. Some goods were found to be on fire in one of the warehouses soon after four o'clock in the afternoon of Friday week. The firemen and workpeople got their manual engine, and tried to put out the fire; but they had difficulty in getting water, and produced no effect. The alarm was given, and within a quarter of an hour steam and manual engines and firemen were on the spot. The water supply at first was short, and it soon appeared that the Pantheon was doomed and Belgravia threatened. Happily the wind changed, and by four o'clock in the morning the fire was much reduced and the danger was over. Only a portion

of the outer walls was left standing, and "the whole place seemed to have crumpled in." It is said that many of the depositors of goods had such faith in the building as being fireproof as to omit to insure their property. The belief in fireproof buildings will scarcely, we think, survive this tremendous example of its unsoundness. It may almost be said that nothing can save a large warehouse full of goods when fire has once taken hold of it, and certainly iron pillars and floors and stone staircases are the worst possible protection. Mr. Edwin Chadwick, writing in the *Times*, says that the opinion he collected among the firemen was that, with the head the fire had got when the engines arrived, they could not possibly have saved the building. Their services were limited to preventing the spread of the fire. If there had been a strong wind the existing means were insufficient to prevent a devastating conflagration. Fifteen minutes elapsed between the alarm and the arrival of the first effective engine. Mr. Chadwick suggests that for the adequate protection of property this interval ought to be reduced to five minutes; and he states that at the British Museum, by a proper arrangement of hydrants attached to mains under high pressure, water may be thrown on any part of the interior of the building in less than a minute and a half, while at the South Kensington Museum the time required is a little over two minutes. Mr. Chadwick complains that, through ignorance or inattention, a large building should be left unprotected and should expose surrounding property to destruction. But it would be unjust to impute the loss of the Pantheon to these causes. It is evident that this building was thought to be a model of skill and care when it was constructed. In the course of forty years, however, the destructibility of stone and iron has been clearly demonstrated. The time has come to consider whether all large warehouses ought not to be required by law to take precautions against fire similar to those which have been adopted at the British Museum and the South Kensington Museum. "Large and tall and ill-protected warehouses" increase in number, and it is suggested that a fire in one of these in St. Paul's Churchyard might involve the destruction of the Cathedral. In Manchester, where large and tall warehouses abound, water-supply is stated to be more efficient than in London, and yet the Irwell is a tiny brook compared to the Thames. Water from the river at Pimlico, although unwholesome to drink, would be useful to put out fires in Belgravia; and if Mr. Chadwick's system of hydrants be practicable, it ought to be adopted. The pressure on the mains at Manchester gives eighty feet jets from the hydrants, but for the taller buildings additional power is brought to bear by hand and steam engines. "The Police Stations are about half the distance apart that the Fire Brigade Stations are in London, and from constant supply on the mains, and there being no sending for turn-cocks, it appears that the relief is brought to bear in less than one-third of the time at which it can be given in London." We see the engines hurrying with prodigious clatter through the streets, but we should prefer greater efficiency with less display if Mr. Chadwick can teach us how to obtain it. In any other country such an establishment as the Pantheon would have been either managed or supervised by Government. But probably depositors would rather have trusted their property to Mr. Seth Smith and his descendants than to any public department. They seem to have believed in the immunity of his establishment alike from thieves and fire. It would have been an enterprise worthy of a master of the cracksman's art to lay burglarious hands upon the plate and jewels kept there, and would probably have excited as much astonishment as Colonel Blood's attempt to steal the Regalia from the Tower.

The Pantheon will be rebuilt, and doubtless all will be done that can be done for the security of the new building. We may as well discard the word "fireproof," as it is likely to mislead. The only chance of safety lies in dividing the building vertically by brick walls, carried from the basement above the roof, so that if a fire occurs, it may be confined within one compartment, and in having plenty of water and watchmen always ready to apply it. Mr. Chadwick is right in principle, and it is no disparagement to the Fire Brigade to say that they do not come into action as quickly as they would if nearer to the spot where the enemy appears. A fire in a warehouse must be put out in two or three minutes or it will become dangerous, and this rapid despatch can only be performed by firemen with hydrants and hose upon the premises. According to the ideas of the time at which the Pantheon was erected, it was stated that not a piece of wood was exposed anywhere in the building. But it is acknowledged now that good stout timber is more trustworthy than iron for supports, because timber will stand till nearly burnt through, whereas iron will bend or yield under heat, and throw down that which rests upon it. The only safe material for building is substantial brickwork, and that is too expensive to be generally used. The site of the Pantheon is convenient as a depository for goods, and the accompanying risk must, we suppose, be accepted by the neighbourhood. Yet it may be well to take advantage of an opportunity like that which Sydney Smith desired to obtain by burning a bishop to enforce upon the public mind the necessity for inspection and regulation of large warehouses. The incoming Ministry may usefully address themselves to the humble and useful task of legislating for the protection of life and property from fire. We should think it dangerous to erect wooden houses near Belgrave Square, and it is hardly less dangerous to erect a structure of brick and iron, and fill it with furniture and carriages. A Correspondent of the *Times* states that Chicago has been rebuilt

without much additional precaution against fire, and this is exactly what we should have expected. Great blocks of building are embraced under a single flat roof without any party walls carried up through them, and many roofs are of wood and asphalt or shingle. There is, however, plenty of water at Chicago, and the same Correspondent saw people flooding their flat roofs with water on an alarm of fire in the neighbourhood. Brick, says this writer, has proved itself comparatively fireproof. Plaster has afforded, under trying circumstances, protection to materials which would otherwise have yielded. Wooden beams, under certain conditions, have proved more lasting than iron. Concrete floors have stood when stone calcined and gave way. Iron cased in plaster has kept upright, when, unprotected, it bent and gave. There is unanimity among the professional writers in the *Times* in these conclusions. Builders may perhaps be induced to adopt them generally as far as is consistent with the universal demand for cheapness, and in special cases like that of rebuilding the Pantheon it may be expected that a serious effort will be made to attain structural security. But when all has been done that can be done we come back to this, that a fire in a large building must be put out quickly or it becomes unmanageable. Mr. Cole C.B. gives this as the result of his long experience as a keeper of public buildings. "There is," he says, "no other security to be had than vigilant watching with means of instantly extinguishing a little fire as soon as possible after it arises." A hydrant with hose and a constant supply of water should be within easy reach. This at least Londoners might provide for their own protection, and although their water sometimes destroys life, it might be, if properly applied, an effectual means of saving property.

UNDOGOMATIC BELIEF.

IN the January number of the *Contemporary Review* appeared an article by Principal Tulloch, containing the substance of a lecture originally delivered at St. Andrew's University on "Dogmatic Extremes." To this a reply was published some days later in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and then a new apologist of the anti-dogmatic theory took up the cudgels in the February *Contemporary* in the person of Mr. Hunt. Professor Tulloch's title does not strike us as very happily chosen, for his essay is throughout a protest not against extreme parties, as they are often called, in the Church, but against the principle of dogmatic belief altogether, which is common to all professing Christians, not to say Theists, except the little clique to which the writer himself belongs. It is not, however, with the title, but with the argument of the paper, and with the controversy it has evoked, that we are here concerned. Nor do we take up the discussion with any intention of entering on the irritating topic of the honesty or dishonesty of a particular school of clerical theologians, which the disputants on both sides have somewhat needlessly imported into it. The question itself, quite apart from its bearing on the position of religious parties or churches, or indeed on Christianity as such, is of sufficient interest and importance to justify some notice while the opposite pleadings of the *Contemporary* and the *Pall Mall* are still fresh in the minds of their readers.

Principal Tulloch starts with some general observations on the tendency of the present age to extremes of all kinds, political, scientific, and religious, and in illustration of his thesis he specially notes this tendency in the irreligious or atheistic schools, as exemplified in writers like Mr. Matthew Arnold, the late Mr. J. S. Mill, and Strauss, to some of whose works he refers, as well as to the *Life of George Grote*. This "narrowness of vision," whether among believers or unbelievers, he regards as most deplorable and unjust. It is not only bad in itself and unfair to religion, but fatal to human progress, for there must be progress in religions as in all other ideas. Creeds and confessions of faith, of whatever date, are, he considers, valuable as landmarks of the state of knowledge and thought at the time when they were drawn up, and therefore claim our "reverence," but not our "subjection." No man's faith can be permanently bound by the forms either of the seventeenth century or of the fourth. "Men's thoughts about religion," which are embodied in creeds, inevitably change with the lapse of time, but it does not follow that they need abandon Christianity or Theism. Here, however, it seems suddenly to occur to the writer that an awkward question may not unnaturally obtrude itself. "Is there not such a thing as true opinion in religion? Is Christian dogma incapable of verification? Is not the Church the depositary of divine truth . . . and, if not, are we not cast on a sea of doubt, without any rest for mind or heart?" The answer is a little perplexing. On the one hand, Principal Tulloch admits, what indeed he could hardly help admitting, that "no Christian can well deny that there is such a thing as true opinion in religion, and that it is the duty of every one to try and find it." This truth "the Scriptures contain, and the Church gives voice to it." But then, unfortunately, her voice cannot always be trusted. The Westminster Confession declares—and here at least the nineteenth century, it seems, may safely follow the seventeenth—that all Synods or Councils since the Apostles' time may err, and many have erred. Nor is this the worst. Not only are all Churches fallible, but all creeds are, and from the nature of the case must be, false, quite as much as they are true. This, we are assured in italics, is "a fact," for "imperfection or partial error is of the very essence of Christian dogma."

and that fact of course "strikes, or ought to strike, at the very root of all Christian dogmatism"—why not say at once of all Christian dogma? In truth, in every Church those who cling most tenaciously to the dogma are just the men "who have least hold of the divine substance" which it faintly adumbrates. But here again recurs the old, and, as the writer seems uncomfortably conscious, still unanswered question, "Are we to hale between two opinions, or have only half opinions in religion?" And troublesome advocates of "the coarser forms of unbelieving dogmatism"—who are just as bad in one way as the "coarser orthodoxy of the *Record*" in another—will insist on pressing this question home. We do not wonder that Principal Tulloch writhes a little under the pertinacious cross-questioning of these "extreme dogmatists" of opposite schools, and is in no great hurry to bring out the answer which is at last extorted from him. "True religious thought is always and necessarily indefinite. 'Haze,' if you choose to use the expression, is of its very nature." We can form no true idea of the Deity or of the future life; and as for popular Christianity, it is not even religious thought at all, but "a mere accretion of religious traditions," and "the whole function of thought is to purify and idealize inherited traditions." In short, to be an extreme dogmatist is to hold that any dogma—except the dogma of the fallibility of all Churches and Councils—can be more than half true at best, and to prefer definite belief of any sort to "haze."

This certainly does strike one, as it seems to have struck the writer's critic in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, as rather a strange profession of faith to be put forward by a high clerical dignitary who has subscribed that most intensely dogmatic, and by no means hazy, doctrinal compendium, the Westminster Confession. But with these personal aspects of the controversy, as we said before, we shall not meddle here. Principal Tulloch's theory of belief is fairly open to criticism, without any impeachment of his conscientiousness in maintaining it; and a very remarkable theory it is when it comes to be examined. It may be quite true that there is a tendency in various quarters, and quite as much among unbelieving as orthodox thinkers, to rush into extremes. Unbelief is often to the full as dogmatic as the most pronounced Ultramontanism. But that is hardly the point. What Principal Tulloch attacks is not really dogmatism but dogma, which is declared to be in its nature imperfect and variable; at its best estate only "a faint adumbration" of a truth which the mind cannot grasp. No doubt any theist would allow, or rather affirm, the correctness of this statement, in so far as no finite intellect can comprehend the Infinite. But this does not prove that creeds may not be perfectly true as far as they go, nor is the defect one which any "law of progress" has the slightest tendency to cure or to improve. In the year 3000 A.D., if the world lasts so long, men will be no better able than the friends of Job "to find out God"; and on the other hand it is difficult to see how the Apostles' Creed can have become more or less true in the nineteenth century than it was in the first. Let us take for instance its opening clause, to which, if to any, Dr. Tulloch's canon of essential haziness must apply, and which moreover asserts a dogma elevated far above the strife of contending parties in the Scotch or any other Church. Is it true or false? Strauss says plainly that it is false, which is perfectly intelligible. Dr. Newman on the other hand says somewhere that he never could conceive the idea of religion without dogma, for "there can as well be filial love without the fact of a father as devotion without the fact of a Supreme Being," and to accept that fact is at once to accept a dogma of fundamental import, involving far-reaching consequences intellectual and practical. That is to say, in other words, the first article of the creed asserts a momentous truth, which is also quite intelligible. What is simply unintelligible to us is to say with Principal Tulloch that it is neither true nor false, but partly both, inasmuch as partial error is of the essence of all dogma, and "haze" belongs to its nature. Of course if we are to understand that the notion of the Deity may be resolved into a "Kosmos," or "a stream of tendency," that again is clear enough, only the idea would be much better expressed in the "coarser forms" of Strauss and his English admirers, who tell us plainly that there is no God. It would occupy more space than we can afford, besides leading us into questions too solemn for discussion here, to apply Principal Tulloch's canon of criticism in detail to the later articles of the Creed. But it is obvious to remark that they assert facts of the highest interest and significance, if they be facts, or else they assert very audacious and misleading fictions; but in neither case is there any haziness about the statement. The miraculous and other events thus recorded either did or did not take place; there may be a conflict of evidence as to the truth of what is asserted, but there can be none as to its meaning. To believe or disbelieve it, or to give a verdict of not proven and suspend one's judgment, are intelligible states of mind; but to speak of its being partly true and partly false, but offering "a faint adumbration" of the truth, is, begging the essayist's pardon, to talk nonsense. If "it is a mere assertion of religious tradition," it is false; if it is "a divine verity," there is no sort of haze about it, and it is quite incapable of being "purified and idealized" by any progressive development of religious thought. We may add that the men who actually drew up and propagated these old creeds, at the risk of their own lives, were as far as possible from sharing this fastidious horror of "dogmatic extremes," and considering haziness a first condition of their orthodoxy. It is perhaps not too much to say that, if they had entertained the nebulous theory of Christian belief which finds favour with a select coterie of our modern

divines, Christianity would not have outlasted the century of its birth, and certainly would not have triumphed over the brute force of the vastest and most strongly compacted Empire the world has ever known.

Something of this kind was urged—for we do not profess to have been exactly following his argument—by the writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* just now referred to. Dr. Tulloch has made no rejoinder, but Mr. Hunt, smarting apparently under a keen sense of *proximus ardor*, comes to the rescue, in the *Contemporary* of this month, to demolish what he calls the "savage" criticism of the *Pall Mall Gazette*. We cannot but think he would have been wiser to leave the matter in the congenial "haze" in which his abler confederate had enveloped it. He begins, as we have seen, by "abusing the plaintiff's attorney," and the greater part of his subsequent pleading is a pure paralogism, except the defence of the position of the Broad Church clergy, which comes to saying, *valeat quantum*, that their subscription to Creeds and Articles is only provisional, and that they have never concealed their opinion that "a restatement of the chief doctrines of Christianity is much to be desired." On which it is sufficient to observe that most of them have said nothing of the kind, and that Principal Tulloch's indictment holds good equally against any conceivable statement of doctrine, new or old. The main part of Mr. Hunt's argument, however, is based on what we must take leave to call a mere verbal quibble about the etymology of the word dogma. Every schoolboy knows well enough that its primary meaning is a decree, and that it only came secondarily to mean a doctrine because doctrines were ruled or defined by ecclesiastical authority. But to infer from this that Roman Catholics alone are consistent in adhering to any dogmatic belief is to start an entirely fresh and independent subject of discussion. In point of fact, Protestants have held and do hold "dogmatic belief" just as much as Roman Catholics, to say nothing of a large section of Christians of whom Mr. Hunt has evidently never heard, as he takes Catholic and Protestant as an exhaustive division. We mean of course the Eastern Church, which yields to none in the rigid definiteness of its creed. Whether Protestants or Greeks have adequate evidence for the doctrines they profess may be an interesting subject for inquiry; but it has very little to do with the issue raised by Principal Tulloch. Roman Catholics ought to be grateful to Mr. Hunt for his assurance that they alone have any right to put faith in the creeds which for Protestants are simply "opinions without authority;" especially as he is kind enough to add that of all theories of revelation that of the Church of Rome is most like what we should beforehand have expected from the Divine Being, and that to establish such a Church "would have been much the best way" to secure a true faith among men. In short, he is so far from agreeing with Principal Tulloch as to the inherent impossibility of a dogmatic religion, that he thinks this would have been much the most natural form of Christianity, and best suited to the minds of men. But then, unhappily, there is "the clearest evidence" that "Catholicism is untenable," and so we must manage to do without it. This may or may not be so, but it is simply giving up the argument. However, Mr. Hunt does essay to grapple with the writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* on one point, though with very questionable success. He is extremely indignant at any one calling the articles of the Apostles' Creed "dogmas"; and argues, if we rightly understand him, that the facts asserted there may be believed, while the "dogmas made out of them" must be rejected as false; and he goes on to specify the dogmas of the bodily resurrection of Christ and of the Trinity, which last, as now held, is declared to be an "absurdity." With the theological merits of this ingenious hypothesis we are not concerned here; but we must venture to observe that the alleged distinction between facts and dogmas in the Creed reminds us irresistibly of an analogy suggested in the *Pall Mall*. It sounds very like saying that the Claimant's account of the facts of his past life must indeed be accepted as true, but that "when we begin to make a dogma out of it" by asserting his identity with Sir Roger Tichborne, we are indulging in unauthorized and possibly absurd "speculations." The Reviewer's remaining point is that certain objectionable dogmas, such as Calvinism, were once popular, but have now gone out of fashion, which at best only helps to prove—what nobody dreams of disputing—that false doctrines may prevail as well as true ones, but has no bearing either way on the principle of dogmatic belief.

We began with pointing out that the contention of Principal Tulloch concerns no mere quarrel between High Church and Broad Church, or even between Christianity and other forms of faith. It cuts at the root of all religious systems, for it miscalculates or ignores the religious element in human nature. We may test it philosophically or on the *solvitur ambulando* method, and in either case with the same result. No religion professing to rest on divine revelation and aspiring to influence mankind can afford to hold its doctrines in solution, nor has any religion without a definite creed ever worked its way and left its mark on the world. What Professor Max Müller calls the three missionary religions of this day, Christianity, Mahometanism, and Buddhism, are all dogmatic, though their doctrines are widely different. Judaism, when it was a living faith, was fiercely dogmatic. Protestantism in the heyday of its power, when it broke through the prescription of centuries and wrested half Europe from the allegiance of Rome, was passionately, almost fanatically, dogmatic. It is very well for Mr. Hunt to say that in substituting private judgment for authority it sapped the foundations of dogmatism, and that Protestants are "illogical" in regarding their creeds as

anything more than records of opinion. At all events the Reformers did not think so, and when he has persuaded the great body of Protestants to embrace his view, Protestantism, as a religion, will be dead. To cite the words of a writer whose "coarser form of unbelief" excites Principal Tulloch's peculiar indignation, but who seems to us here to be simply giving utterance to an incontrovertible truism:—"To be a Christian in any real sense, you must start from a dogma of the most tremendous kind, and an undogmatic creed is as senseless as a statue without shape or a picture without colour. Unsectarian means unchristian . . . But accept that belief; think for a moment of all that it implies; and you must admit that your Christianity becomes dogmatic in the highest degree. Unsectarian Christianity can no more exist thus than can a triangle which is neither scalene nor isosceles nor equilateral." The same might be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of Islamism or Buddhism. There is a story told of an unfortunate Englishman who was hung at Constantinople, not for being a Christian—for Christianity was tolerated—but because his pious hatred of "dogmatic extremes" made it impossible to discover whether he was a Christian or not, and the law required every one to profess some definite religion. We are far from wishing to advocate so trenchant a mode of enforcing the necessary connexion between faith and form, but the Turkish Government showed a true instinct about the facts. All experience combines to testify against the stability and working power of "hazy" and amorphous creeds.

THE DAUPHIN AGAIN.

M. JULES FAVRE has been pleading a case in Paris which reads amazingly like a romance by the late Mr. James. The beginning of his speech sufficiently indicates the school in which he has been studying:—"Forty years ago, on the 26th of May, 1833, a stranger, still in the prime of manhood, but wasted by fatigue and suffering, without resources, and scarcely able to speak our language, entered Paris. He passed through the indifferent crowd, but an attentive observer might have discovered in his countenance traces of an indomitable firmness and a profound faith in the future." This stranger, according to M. Favre, was no other than Louis XVII., who had come to assert his title to be recognized as the Duke of Normandy and the heir of the Legitimate Monarchy. The narrative of the pretender's extraordinary adventures, while it certainly proves his indomitable resolution, scarcely justifies his faith in the future. He had to flee from one country to another, his life was constantly in danger, and the greater part of his time was spent in prison. He died miserably in Holland, having, it is said, been poisoned. He left two children; Adalbert Naundorff—Naundorff being the name under which the alleged Dauphin passed in private life—a lieutenant in the Dutch army, and a daughter; and these are now prosecuting their father's claim. There was a judicial decision against the elder Naundorff himself in 1836, and a decision against his heirs in 1851; and it is from the latter judgment that an appeal is now made.

Whatever the Court may think of it, it is certainly a marvellous story which M. Favre has set before it. There is of course nothing impossible or even improbable in the supposition that the Dauphin was rescued from the Temple. Indeed, nothing is more likely than that such a design was entertained, and that an attempt may have been made to carry it out; and there are many ways in which it might have been managed. It has been often asserted that the young prince did really escape, and more than one Louis XVII. has started up to assert his rights. Still the mere fact that a thing is possible or even probable does not show that it happened. In the present instance it is alleged that the Dauphin was thrown into a profound sleep by a dose of opium, and deposited in secret place at the top of the tower. A lay figure was at first placed on his bed to lull suspicion, but afterwards a deaf and dumb child was smuggled into the Temple and passed off as the Dauphin. The next thing was to get the young prince out of the prison. It was thought that if the deaf and dumb child would only die, the prince might be put in the coffin instead of him, and so carried out. As the child showed no signs of dying, it was resolved to kill him, and an apothecary undertook to administer a sufficient dose of poison. A doctor, however, administered an antidote and the child was saved. Shortly after both the doctor and the apothecary died suddenly in a suspicious manner which pointed to poison. As the deaf and dumb boy persisted in living, a sick child from a hospital was substituted for him. This child soon died, and the Dauphin took his place in the coffin, the series of substitutions being completed on the way to the cemetery by the Dauphin being taken out and the coffin being filled with paper and stones. The prince had been for eight or nine months in the roof of the tower, but whether he was in a swoon all that time does not exactly appear, for M. Favre says he does not care for details. The removal of the Dauphin is said to have been concerted by a number of persons friendly to the Royal family, including Josephine de Beauharnais, Barras, Hoche, Pichegru, and others; and it may be assumed that it could not have been carried out without the connivance of some of the officials. It strikes one that, if it was so easy to effect all these changes and substitutions, and to pass off first one child and then another as the Dauphin, it would have been possible to adopt the simple expedient of carrying him off for pretended burial at once. M. Favre stated that after Josephine's marriage to Bonaparte

the coffin was taken up, and was found to be filled with rubbish. Moreover, in 1814, Josephine communicated her secret to the Emperor of Russia, and so alarmed the Count of Provence (Louis XVIII.) that he endeavoured to purchase her silence by offering her son a marshal's baton and a province of France. It is also asserted that Louis XVIII., on his death-bed directed his Ministers to examine the papers in a certain chest which would show who was the rightful heir, and that after an examination of them they were disposed to proclaim the Duke of Normandy King, but were overruled by Cardinal de Latil.

The history of the alleged Dauphin's adventures after his escape from prison is quite as wonderful as the manner of his abduction. The luckless prince, M. Favre said, was betrayed and persecuted wherever he went. He was first taken to La Vendée, where his friends after a time abandoned him and took up another child instead. He fled to Rome, but was driven away by the persecutions of his enemies. On his way to London he was captured by a French man-of-war and again cast into prison. Josephine procured his release; but immediately afterwards he was once more in prison at Strasburg, and Josephine had to repeat her kindness. He was then twenty-four years of age, had been hunted from one country to another, and had passed seventeen years in prison, so it was no wonder, M. Favre thought, that he should have forgotten the language of his childhood. He had picked up German from the wife of a Swiss clockmaker who had befriended him, and watchmaking from her husband. The name of Naundorff was adopted merely because it happened to be on a passport—he had none of his own—which was given him by some charitable person in order to enable him to enter Berlin. In 1815, when Louis XVIII. became King, Naundorff made himself known as the genuine heir to the throne, and in consequence got into trouble, and was repeatedly imprisoned. In 1833 he contrived to reach Paris, where he met and was recognized by Madame de Rambaud, the old governess of the Dauphin. He is also said to have been identified by M. de Joly, the last Minister of the Interior of Louis XVI. Madame de Rambaud was convinced by Naundorff remembering a child's frock which she showed him as one which he had worn at a fête at Versailles, and which had afterwards been discarded as too heavy. M. de Joly at first denounced the pretender as an impostor, but was converted when the latter reminded him that after the Royal family took shelter in the Assembly, De Joly procured some food, and the King and Queen were rather doubtful about it lest it should have been poisoned, but the prince said, "Never mind, give me a spoon." Naundorff was not allowed to remain long in Paris. Undeterred by the condemnation of an impostor named Richemond to twelve years' seclusion for pretending to be Louis XVII., he commenced legal proceedings to compel the Bourbon family to acknowledge his rights; but a hint that the police were coming down on him frightened him off to England. The number of attempted assassinations which this wretched "victim of reasons of State" managed to survive, according to M. Favre's story, is certainly startling. At Strasburg his enemies, in order to obliterate his features, pricked and stabbed him in the face and rubbed corrosive acid into the wounds. At Prague he was stabbed in the street, and in London he was fired at when walking in his garden. His death in Holland is attributed to poison.

M. Favre, who is not at all daunted by the marvellous character of the incidents upon which his case is founded, can conceive of no reason why Naundorff should not be acknowledged as the genuine Dauphin, except that it would cause a good deal of inconvenience to most of the Royal families of Europe—a very trifling matter in M. Favre's eyes. It must be admitted that the story on the other side is simpler and more coherent. The result of the judicial inquiry in 1836, as set forth in the official documents, may be briefly stated. It is asserted that Naundorff was born in Prussian Poland; and that in 1812 he was established as a watchmaker at Spandau. In 1822 he went to Brandenburg and was accused of fire-raising. He was acquitted on this charge from want of proof, but was soon afterwards sentenced to three years' imprisonment with hard labour for coining and circulating false money. After various wanderings he came to Paris in 1832, and endeavoured to make weak and enthusiastic minds accept the fable he had concocted. It is admitted that he enlisted a number of adherents, who were duped by the information he had collected about the Dauphin from published memoirs or private conversations with persons who had been in domestic service about the Court. The evidence of the Dauphin's death in the Temple is then examined. The report which was made on the subject to the Convention by a member of the Committee of General Safety states that, soon after the 9th Thermidor, young Capet was placed under the care of a couple of keepers, Lasne and Gomain, both trustworthy men, who previously were acquainted with the personal appearance of their charge, and who could not be deceived by the substitution of another child. In order to render treachery on the part of the keepers impossible, the jealous Government of those days directed that they should be watched by a member of one of the Committees of the Sections of Paris, who should be changed daily. Lasne and Gomain never quitted the prince. Both were present at the moment of his death; he spoke to them an hour before he drew his last breath. He died on the 8th June, 1795, and next day the deputy Sévestre announced the fact to the Convention and deposited the *procès-verbaux* in the archives.

The judgment which was given in 1851 was to the same effect as that of 1836; and a great deal of contempo-

rary evidence on the subject has been summed up by M. de Beauchene in a work which was published in 1852. There can be no doubt that Simon the shoemaker, under whose charge he was first placed, treated the poor boy with savage brutality. He compelled the child to wait on him, to clean his shoes, to perform the most menial and humiliating offices. Every day there was a fresh struggle to get the prince to wear the red cap; he was abused and beaten, but in vain; until at length Simon's virago of a wife cut off the boy's long flaxen ringlets, and he felt so affronted and debased by his altered appearance that his spirit seemed to be broken. The day that the Queen was sent to the Conciergerie, one of the agents of the Commune sent the Dauphin a gift of toys, including a miniature guillotine. He was subjected to an abominable inquisition in order to make him repeat falsehoods about his mother and aunt. He was kept shut up in a dark room, without any amusements, and with no company except Simon and his wife. Simon tried to teach him to drink and swear; and when he caught the child one day at his prayers, struck him in the face with his iron-heeled shoe and poured water over him. The familiar names by which he was called were "wolf-cub," "viper," and "toad." After Simon's removal, this was his fate, as described by Madame Royale:—"Unheard of and unexampled barbarity! to leave an unhappy and sickly infant of eight years old in a great room, locked and bolted in, with no other means of communication than a broken bell, which he never rang, so greatly did he dread the people whom its sound would have brought to him; he preferred wanting anything and everything to calling for his persecutors. His bed had not been stirred for six months, and he had not thought to make it himself; it ran alive with vermin. His linen and person were covered with them. . . . His window, which was locked as well as grated, was never opened; and the infectious smell of the horrid room was so dreadful that no one could bear it for a moment. . . . The length of time which he resisted this persecution proves how good his constitution must have been." After the fall of Robespierre (9th Thermidor) he was found "eaten up with purulent sores." He refused to eat or to speak, until in answer to one of his visitors, a benevolent-looking old man, he said, "I want to die." Barras saw the boy, and found him in a wretched state of filth and disease. His knees had swollen to such an extent that his trousers were painfully tight. The treatment of the prisoner now became less rigorous. His new guardian, Laurent, was fond of him, and did what he could to restore his health and spirits; but his efforts were impeded by the Commissioners, who were changed every day, and besides, it was too late. The poor boy was crushed and heart-broken. The district surgeon reported that "the little Capet had tumours in all his joints, and especially at his knees," and that it was impossible to get a word from him. Lasne, Laurent's successor, was also a good-hearted man, and endeavoured to alleviate the captive's misery. Lasne came on the 29th of March, and the Dauphin died on the 8th of June. The account of his last moments is touching in the extreme. The boy was almost too weak to speak, but he took Gomain's hand in his own and kissed it, while Gomain prayed. Gomain said he hoped he was not in pain now. "Yes," was the reply, "but not so much; the music is so fine." "Where do you hear music?" "Up there; listen, listen!" And after a moment, with a convulsive start, he added, "I hear my mother's voice among them." Then Lasne took his turn by the bedside, and the boy said he hoped his sister would hear the music too. Afterwards he said, "I have something to tell you." Lasne leaned down to listen. The prince was dead.

As far as probabilities go, it was of course extremely likely that the unhappy boy, after all he had gone through, should die from the combined effects of grief, ill-usage, and confinement. It is also much more probable that the pathetic evidence given by Lasne and Gomain is true than that they were capable of inventing it. But then there are a great many persons who do not think it worth while to believe anything that is not in the highest degree improbable, not to say impossible. Whatever the decision of the Court may be in the present case, the Duke of Normandy is tolerably certain to retain a staunch body of adherents.

THE SWISS ARMY.

THE Church and State conflict in Switzerland has become so warm that it has almost dimmed the controversy on army reorganization which has vexed the pleasant little Republic ever since the war of 1870-71. The effect produced among its citizens by German successes and French disasters was not only in no respect less than with us, but was intensified by the sight of Bourbaki's army driven helplessly like a huddled flock of sheep over the frontier by Manteuffel, to be "interned" for the rest of the war, and by the fact that that part of the Swiss forces which was mobilized to guard the sacred soil of the Federation from outrage was found at every point to fall manifestly behind the requirements of the age for an army taking the field. This mobilization, our readers may be reminded, occurred twice. A large force was embodied at the outset of the war to watch the frontier near Basle, which it was apparently supposed that the South Germans might be tempted to violate, as the Allies did in 1814, for strategic purposes. This danger passed away, and the men under arms were dismissed to their homes. But twelve months later, as the plot about Belfort thickened, and rumours came of enormous concentrations of troops on either side to break

or guard General Werder's investment of the fortress, a fresh set of hasty preparations was made to watch the hostile operations, the echoes of which resounded through the Jura; and it was to the Republican force then ordered to the frontier, commanded as in the previous summer by General Herzog, that Clinchant (who succeeded to Bourbaki's ill-starred office) surrendered his fugitive legions almost under General Manteuffel's eyes. All this brought war home in a manner to the Swiss, and their unpreparedness for it stood fully revealed to themselves as soon as General Herzog presented his Reports on the two mobilizations to the Federal Executive at Berne.

It is not our intention to follow those Reports here in detail. The Swiss of course were well aware before that they had no army, in the sense of a standing force in pay throughout the year. But they had a general belief that their militia would prove, thanks to the intelligence and patriotism of its elements, a tolerable substitute. They knew that they were supposed to have army divisions, a staff, autumn manoeuvres, and a long list of officers of various arms understood to be educated for their special duties. And it was with all the annoyance of one rudely shaken out of a pleasant dream that the nation learnt from General Herzog's earliest Report, and the discussions which arose upon it, not only that a good deal must be done before the national force could cope with any standing army, but that it had proved itself in all its elements far below the moderate standard which it had been intended to reach when it was framed twenty years before under the then newly revised Constitution. Viewed as militia alone—and the pretence of any other name for it may here be dropped—it was found to be far less perfectly organized than even a militia force might, under thorough control, be made.

The theory of the Swiss military force was this. Following out the favourite national idea of a federation of Republics, it was to consist not of a homogeneous body, but of various contingents assigned to the different Cantons, and proportioned according to their respective means, not only as regards population, but the special circumstances which were supposed to fit the inhabitants for such or such particular arm. But it occurred at once to the framers of the Constitution of 1848 that it would be absurd to leave the technical parts of an army to mere municipal training and equipment. Consequently the Federal Government was charged from the first with the instruction and supervision of the cavalry, artillery, and engineers, and somewhat later with that of the rifle battalions, which may be looked upon as the crack corps of the service, and have often to be made up from two adjacent Cantons. The army staff was purely a Federal affair; but the infantry were left, under certain conditions, entirely to the Cantons, each of which up to the present time maintains its own petty war department, charged chiefly with the equipment and instruction of this arm. It follows that there are three distinct classes of officers in the Swiss militia. The Federal staff, which includes various civil departments, receive their commissions direct from the central authority at Berne, and such instruction as they have from its chief school at Thun. The officers of the special arms are all appointed by the Cantons, but are put through their original and practice trainings under Federal inspectors and in the Federal schools—or classes, as they may be more properly termed—established at Thun or elsewhere. The infantry are raised, taught, and exercised entirely by the Cantons under drill instructors of their own, and their officers have nothing to do with the Federal authority at all, save when called out for autumn exercises, an event not occurring on an average to each of the nine divisions maintained on paper more than once in seven or eight years. Their efficiency in fact depended entirely on the public spirit of their own individual Cantons, and the Constitution provided no remedy against any defaulting member of the Republic except the cumbersome and grave one of "Federal execution," which it is needless to say the central authority could not use in practice for any minor deficiencies.

Now, as the twenty years that followed the struggle of the Sonderbund were tranquil as concerned Switzerland, it is not surprising that there crept into the working of the military machine a laxity which increased as time went on and the occasion for the use of the force was still deferred. The Swiss militia never indeed sank down to that mere paper existence which became the normal state of things in America before the great Civil War. But the period of recruit drill was shortened. The annual training prescribed sank in the infantry to one every two or even three years, under the constant pressure put on the Cantonal authorities to postpone it. And even the arms under Federal supervision curtailed their exercises, partly no doubt under the influence of the example of their infantry comrades, and partly because it was felt that there would be a difficulty in finding effectives for their ranks if their training was maintained at the original standard. Herr Staempfli had long before pointed out, to the surprise of his countrymen, that the popular tradition that "every Swiss is liable to bear arms" had been altogether departed from in the case of nearly half the population. And it fell to General Herzog to astonish them still more after the summer mobilization of 1870, when, in the cool analysis of a professional Report—clear, incisive, but not overdrawn—he showed that the special contingents borne on the muster-roll were lacking in all the essentials for war, that the paper departments which existed in the War Office at Berne were either unreal or unpractical, and that the infantry battalions furnished to his force by the Cantons were some of them in such a condition as, to use his own phrase, "must make the heart of any patriot sad."

Then came a short paradise of army reformers. Quicker even than our own press two years since, the busy press of the Republic threw out letters, essays, and hastily-written octavos. The military question became the leading one of the day. And, as the time coincided with the end of the twenty years for which alone the old military Act was to run, there was every legal reason in favour of those who pressed for some considerable modification of its provisions. Of course there was a large party of resistance to reform; there were men either purely conservatives by nature, or democratic haters of "militarism," or personally interested in opposing the extension of personal service and taxation which was demanded. They were little heard of for the time, however, and have only very recently found their voice in the press. But it was a weighty element in their favour that no great military change could be introduced without the revision of the existing Constitution; and when this came in question there were sure to be other large elements opposed to change, especially the French Radical section of the South-West, which feared the centralization that would bring it more into the power of the dominant German-speaking population, and the Ultramontane party, which hoped to control as of old certain individual Cantons, and could only lose by the merging of local powers in the hands of a Federal Government of strong Protestant sympathies. These factions, indeed, united with the more commonplace haters of change, managed to throw out the revised Constitution when it was put to the plebiscite last May, and so have given the army reformers another year in which to adjust their differences among themselves.

The more ardent of these, in the first heat of enthusiasm, had advocated extreme measures. They would have enrolled every man capable of doing any service, distributed the country into regular districts with a permanent staff, extended considerably the periods of instruction, registered all the horses for such service as they might be useful for, and called out each division or army corps at least once in two years, so as to work the whole of its departments, which were of course to be efficiently completed. But to such large schemes there will always be this objection in Switzerland, independently of the considerable expense they threaten, that they never can be carried far enough to enable the little Republic to cope with the great Empires which border it. Switzerland has not in fact the size or the population requisite to enable her to enter on the general European theatre with any decisive force. Her efforts, if attacked, would almost necessarily be confined to making as good a defence as possible until succour came from without. This truth has probably been felt, though not distinctly uttered, by the more moderate military reformers. These are represented nearly by the present Federal Executive, which succeeded last year, as again in the recent Session, in obtaining a majority in both Houses in favour of its scheme. That scheme may be defined briefly as completing the law of 1850 by making the training of the special arms slightly better, completing the necessary civil departments (which exist at present chiefly on paper), and bringing the infantry under the effective control of the Berne War Office. With some slight modifications in favour of the privileges of the Cantons (which are found very obstinate in retaining their local War Departments) it seems probable that this measure of reform will be adopted. If it be fairly carried out, Switzerland will possess a militia as efficient as any such citizen-soldier force can be made in a free country not absolutely threatened by war; but the vision entertained by some enthusiastic advocates of the system, that it can vie with that of standing armies, is one that is most unlikely to be realized, and it is to be hoped that practical proof may be spared it. The most prominent defect will remain as now, that the army staff are not merely untrained for their special duties, as was not long since the case with ourselves, but that they are in fact little better than civilians bearing military titles; for the classes of instruction they attend are no more than sufficient, by the confession of Colonel Welti himself, who has had the charge of the new law, to enable them to find out what they ought to study. To say that they can know nothing personally of the divisions to which they are attached for manoeuvres or mobilization would come ill as a reproach from us, who persist, with all the means at hand for correcting it, in voluntarily maintaining this element of confusion and weakness in our own organization. And one useful lesson at least we might learn from the Swiss militia, namely, a wholesome jealousy of degrading the higher military titles. Colonels and majors are indeed almost as cheap in that country as our Auxiliary Force commissions and honorary rank have made them here. But the commission of general, so wantonly scattered among ourselves as to become meaningless, is reserved in Switzerland for him who actually takes command in the field; and the title which he retains when his service is done forms a patent higher than that of nobility in his fellow-countrymen's eyes, and is of itself a sufficient reward.

Whilst all things tend among the Swiss to a practical solution of the military question as their means allow, there are not wanting those who would give up even such organization as they possess, in blind faith that patriotism and intelligence would supply its place against French or Prussian army corps as easily as against Charles the Bold's legions of men-at-arms in the middle ages. Herr Staempfli at the very beginning of the agitation found it necessary to explain seriously to some of his fellow-citizens that the days for defending a country with halberd and pike are gone by. But national fancies are hard to kill. And not only has the stuff on which this patriotic delusion feeds been of late scattered through the Swiss press, but Herr von Erlach, one of the extremists in the direction indicated, has rushed into print in Germany with an octavo volume, written apparently to let all the world know how

defenceless the Republic would be if the anti-reformers got their own way. To do away absolutely with the present organization, to rely entirely on parish militia officered by the municipality, to let every man carry just what weapon he chooses, and, for the rest, to put faith in such "sublime" efforts as those of the Poles in 1863, or the Parisians in 1871—such are the teachings scattered through two hundred pages by the author of *Wiedergeburt des Eidgenössischen Wehrseins*. As a curiosity of literature his effusion is well worth reading; and, as the Swiss can hardly desire to undergo the fate of Poland or Paris, the author's proposals to his countrymen probably carry their own antidote with them in the illustrations which he offers.

THE WHITE PILGRIM.

THE programme of the Court Theatre might be succinctly stated as "Births, Deaths, and Marriages." We really do not know, nor we believe does anybody else, what the first piece is about, but we do know that Mr. W. J. Hill is very funny over his twin children. The second piece is that harrowing composition, the *White Pilgrim*, and the third is the jolly rollicking *Wedding March*. We do not know exactly with what object the second piece of the evening was written, but if it were intended to make the third go well, the authors have certainly succeeded. The most tragic of tragedies could hardly be expected to find a home at the Court Theatre, and to be played on the same night with the longest and most uproarious farce. Yet we must allow that a bold attempt has been made with considerable success. The blank verse of the *White Pilgrim* is good, and deserves to be more uniformly well delivered, and the stage accessories, such as thunder, lightning, darkness, and the apparition of Death, are used effectually to deepen the gloom and horror of the story. Mr. George Rignold looks and acts the character of Harold well, and Mr. Vezin does the best that can be done with the singularly hopeless character of Sigurd. It may be feared that the public will not be greatly attracted by the goodness of the blank verse, and therefore we feel called upon to say that this is the best ghost story that has been produced lately upon any stage. It would perhaps be more effective in a larger house, and certainly the minor parts might be more strongly cast. Still, it is worth seeing, if only for the contrast it affords to everything else that is now being played in London.

The character which bears the name of Harold has been drawn by various hands. Scott wrote a poem called *Harold the Dauntless*, and somebody else wrote a poem with a Harold, or some such character in it, which was pronounced by the critics to be much more like Scott's style than was Scott's own work. We do not suggest that the authors of this play have borrowed from Scott, because almost anybody could write as good lines as Scott wrote in his careless moods:—

Young Harold was feared for his hardihood,
His strength of frame, and his fury of mood!

Harold's father had become in some very limited sense of the word Christian, but whether the Bishop converted him or he the Bishop is perhaps doubtful. What is certain is, that they dined together, and both wine and talk flowed freely. Meanwhile, Harold had quarrelled with his father on the religious question, and left the castle, followed by a faithful page, whom he thus addressed:—

Canst thou, as my follower should,
Wade ankle-deep through foeman's blood,
Dare mortal and immortal foe,
The gods above, the fiends below,
And man on earth more hateful still,
The very fountain-head of ill?

Harold, in performance of an after-dinner vow, visits the castle of the Seven Shields, where he sees a spectre, and receives a warning to repent of his evil life. He remembers this warning at the moment when he is about to slay a foe, and spares him, and then he learns that the spectre was his father, now deceased, who is doomed to wander on earth until his son should turn to grace. Harold also has a dream, in which he sees three knights who lead a black horse, and invite him to mount upon it:—

The first proclaimed, in sounds of fear,
"Harold the Dauntless, welcome here!"
The next cried, "Jubilee! we've won
"Count Witikind, the Waster's son!"
And the third rider sternly spoke,
"Mount in the name of Zernebeck!"
From us, O Harold, were thy powers,
Thy strength, thy dauntlessness are ours;
Nor think, a vassal thou of Hell,
With Hell to strive.

Harold accepts this warning and repents, and after a hand-to-hand fight with the god Odin, who tries to carry off his page, and whom he puts to rout, he discovers that the rescued page is a young lady who is in love with him, and he is christened and married on the same day.

This poem is interesting as an example how very badly Scott could write, and also as containing a Harold something like the Harold of the *White Pilgrim*. Scott, however, gave us plenty of horrors in the story, but allowed a happy ending, which he introduced by observing that a young man had much better marry and settle instead of going about the world drinking, swearing, and braining people with his club:—

Oh, dull of heart, through wild and wave,
In search of blood and death to rave,
With such a partner nigh!

The morality is here better than the poetry. The modern authors, however, allow their Harold short time on earth for repentance, and none for amended life. They have preserved an inflexible austerity, and much praise is due to the actors and some to the audience that such a play passed safely through the ordeal of a first night. The conflict between Christianity and Paganism is well exhibited in the love of Harold for Thordisa, and the contrast in the opening scene between the song from the banquet hall and the psalm from the chapel is cleverly imagined. It is indeed a sort of prologue to the play, in which Harold fluctuates under the contending influences of good and evil. The leading idea of the play is manifestly the same as that of Scott's poem, but we are bound to say that a passage which has been quoted from the play in the *Times* is better written than any passage of similar length that can be found in the poem. Blank verse has at least this advantage, that you need not resort to despicable shifts for rhyme:—

Earl Olaf swore the oath in fearful words ;
And as the mighty rafters rang again,
In ominous sound of ominous laughter back,
He called on Death to register the vow.

Harold is persuaded by Sigurd and his riotous companions to repeat the oath of his ancestor, Earl Olaf. He swears that should a Norman cross his threshold he will kill him within a month, and calls on the powers of heaven or hell to take him if he breaks his oath. The White Pilgrim is Death, who appears, dim and shadowy, in answer to this invocation. A thought more awful than any that this tragedy inspires is that it is certain to be burlesqued. The love-making here is at the beginning, whereas Scott placed it at the end. Harold and Thordisa come to an understanding. The lady gives him a cross and chain, and he might have been christened and married out of hand, but she goes on a most unseasonable pilgrimage. It is abundantly clear that if he had married her she would have turned his bachelor friends out of the castle, and therefore Sigurd has an intelligible reason for counteracting Thordisa's influence. No sooner is she gone than he takes the impious oath, and the next moment a Norman Count and his wife seek shelter in the castle. Many men less bold and blasphemous than Harold are capable of doing what Harold did, which was to flirt with a married lady, while his own future wife was gone upon her pilgrimage. But Harold has his oath weighing upon his soul, and he flirts as he drinks to distract thought, and also because he likes it. The lady is warned of the danger to her husband's life, and on the last day of the month she exerts herself to fascinate and detain Harold, so that he may have no opportunity to kill the Count. Thordisa returns and learns the unhappy state of things, and in despair at her lover's infidelity she forgets her Christian hopes and duties, and desires that she may die. The White Pilgrim appears again, and tells her that her prayer is granted, and that in the grave she shall find the peace which is denied on earth. The speech of Death and other speeches of the play touch with much power and pathos topics not often handled on the stage. Harold tells Sigurd that he has destroyed his happiness here and hereafter, and that when they meet in the place of lost souls they will be strangers. Another speech of Harold slightly savours of Othello's final words, and throughout the play there are reproductions of thoughts appropriate to the circumstances which have naturally occurred to other poets handling the same themes before. The truth is that this is a very well-written poem; but its merits are rather dimmed by the inadequate delivery of some of the best passages. The actor who has to tell the story of Earl Olaf's oath appears the same evening as the embarrassed husband in the *Wedding March*. How can any man, except of rare genius, do things so very different equally well, and how can we expect to find a rare genius making himself generally useful at a small theatre? The lines spoken by the White Pilgrim would become the mouth of the best elocutionist of any age:—

Miscall me not ! My generous fulness lends
Home to the homeless, to the friendless friends ;
To the starved babe, the mother's tender breast,
Wealth to the poor, and to the restless rest.

We all remember the text on which this commentary hangs, and an effective speaker of these lines must command the sympathy of every person in the theatre. The talent for appearing and disappearing in ghostly fashion is different from that of delivering blank verse, and some good actors and speakers have made very awkward ghosts in *Hamlet*. If it could have been expected that this play would succeed the manager might perhaps have made more perfect arrangements for its production. That the attempt was made, and that it has partially succeeded, is a remarkable and encouraging feature in the dramatic history of our time. The play does not end as well as it began. It is difficult for a pair of lovers to die gracefully on the floor, and the spectators are probably aware that it will be necessary to clear away the dead bodies, and make way for the wedding rout. But it may at least be said that, in order to enjoy the third piece at the Court Theatre, one ought to see the second.

REVIEWS.

NEWMAN'S HISTORICAL SKETCHES.*

THIS last published volume of Dr. Newman's *Historical Sketches* is not less graceful and interesting than that which we reviewed a year ago, though it is perhaps, to Protestants at least, less entirely agreeable reading. For it is to some extent controversial, and brings us upon topics where, although we can admire as heartily as ever his literary skill and his sympathetic insight into character, we are nevertheless obliged to interrupt the pleasure of following his train of thought by stopping to note what seem to us the unsound parts of his arguments, and the questionable assumptions upon which those arguments are based. It consists of a series of sketches of the lives and work of several early Saints and Fathers of the Church, beginning with St. Basil and ending with St. Benedict of Nursia, and including Basil himself, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, St. Anthony, St. Augustine, St. Martin of Tours, St. John Chrysostom, and Theodoret. Of one or two of these great men, and in particular of Theodoret, something like a full biography is given; of others we have only brief notices, dwelling on some particular point of their respective careers, or taking them as representatives of some feature of their times, or some tendency or characteristic of the Catholic Church. Thus monastic asceticism is described and vindicated in the person of Anthony, and the monastic life of the West, its aim, its organization, and its practical results on the world, are elucidated in an essay on the labours of St. Benedict. For historical purposes, the value of these sketches would have been increased if the general history of the times had been more fully described instead of being merely assumed as known. But Dr. Newman does not appear to be here writing primarily for historical students. His aim is partly that of a theologian illustrating certain religious or moral truths by the example of these men; partly that of an acute observer of human nature who is interested in character as character, and enjoys the study of men's acts and words for the sake of the general psychological lessons that may be drawn from them; partly that of a polemical advocate of modern Roman Catholic doctrine and practice, who desires to vindicate the latter as grounded on primitive usage, and sanctioned by the lives of persons whom Christians of all subsequent ages have agreed in venerating. His method of doing so is, for literary and dramatic purposes, by far the best—that of making extracts from the writings and especially from the correspondence of these early Saints, in which they depict their own feelings and motives, trace in their own words the development of their characters, and exhibit, consciously or unconsciously, the view they took of the conditions and questions of their time. Working these extracts into his own narrative of the lives of Gregory, Chrysostom, and Theodoret, he gives us a refined and sympathetic delineation of their hearts and minds, and brings them near to us in a way which the regular historian scarcely attempts and seldom succeeds in. To be sure, there are some defects in such a process either from an historical or a purely biographical point of view. It does not present to us the whole of the man, either by himself or as a factor in the great events of his time, but sets forth rather an aspect of the man which is true so far as it goes, but is not necessarily the entire truth, and which may leave us far enough from being in a position to pass a fair judgment upon his place and work. For when we ask what are the shadows, the defects, in an otherwise admirable character, the question does not always spring from the base desire to drag all mankind down to a common level, but sometimes from the feeling that humanity is in a certain sense dignified by its weaknesses, and that a more cheerful view may be taken of it when it is seen what are the frailties associated with even the highest virtues. We ask also, How did the man in whose writings we discover these noble aspirations, this tenderness, this delicacy of sentiment, actually comport himself in life? Did he act up to his ideas? Did people round him feel what was in him and recognize the loftiness of his aims? Was he a saint to them in his acts as he has been to posterity in his words? Not that Dr. Newman seeks to conceal the defects of his heroes, or that he does not feel how needful a picture of their outer as well as their inner life is. He desires to give some impression of it; in some instances he actually does give it, and in the case of Theodoret, for example, presents us with a most interesting study of the contrast between his actual duties as a bishop and those for which nature had fitted him, and which he would probably have discharged with more fame and success. Nor do we complain of Dr. Newman's taking the most favourable view of those whom he describes, for he is a biographer, and they are Saints—a word which necessarily means more to him than to us. Those whom the deliberate judgment of the Church has canonized or beatified he feels himself scarcely entitled to criticize freely from a purely human point of view. Our objection, if it can be called an objection, is rather to this form of biography, which aims rather at giving an aspect of the man in particular crises of his life, and in the light of particular theories, than a simple account of him, and which touches too slightly on the general history of the time to enable us to form a clear conception of his place in it and his results on it. The method and the manner in which it is applied in the book are full of charm and of value, but it is a value rather of a devotional and

* *Historical Sketches*, Vol. 2. By John Henry Newman, of the Oratory, sometime Fellow of Oriel College. London : Pickering.

psychological than of an historical kind ; and for the purposes of history it needs both additions and corrections.

We are half unwilling to make this criticism, because it may seem to detract from the worth of an effort which, as it is important everywhere, is nowhere more important than in the case of the great writers and politicians of the early Church—the effort to give a moving and breathing life to persons who have become mere names to nearly all readers of history. These ancient Fathers are to most of the Roman Catholics and Anglicans who still study them—few enough now—little more than impersonations of dry and abstract virtues ; while by the educated modern world at large they are almost forgotten ; they have at any rate fallen altogether dead, as Mr. Carlyle would say ; they have become uninteresting, because incomprehensible. With the popular dislike to them as men who are supposed to have given Christianity a dogmatic turn, Dr. Newman has of course no sympathy, and he holds it in so much contempt that he does not care to oppose it ; what he seeks is rather to protest—which he does with all the ardour of a poetical temperament, and in what Mr. Matthew Arnold would call the truly literary spirit—against the tendency among those of his own faith to make the Fathers so much Saints that they cease to be men :—

What I want to trace and study is the real, hidden, but human life in the "interior," as it is called, of such glorious creations of God, and this I gain with difficulty from mere biographies. Those biographies are most valuable, both as being true and as being edifying ; they are true to the letter as far as they record facts and acts ; I know it ; but facts are not enough for sanctity ; we must have saintly motives, and as to these motives, the actions themselves seldom carry the motives along with them. In consequence, they are often supplied simply by the biographer out of his own head, and with good reason supplied from the certainty which he feels that since it is the act of a saint which he is describing, therefore it must be a saintly act. Properly and naturally supplied, I grant ; but I can do that as well as he, and ought to do it for myself, and shall be sure to do it if I make the Saint my meditation. The biographer in that case is no longer a mere witness and reporter, he has become a commentator. He gives me no insight into the Saint's *interior*, he does but tell me to infer that the Saint acted in some transcendent way from the reason of the case, or to hold it as faith because he has been canonized. For instance, when I read in such a life, "The Saint when asked a question was silent from humility," or, "from compassion for the ignorance of the speaker," or "in order to give him a gentle rebuke"—I find motive assigned, whichever of the three is selected, which is the biographer's own, and perhaps has two chances to one against its being the right one. We read of an occasion on which St. Athanasius said nothing, but smiled when a question was put to him ; it was another Saint who asked the question, and who has recorded the smile ; but he does not more than doubtfully explain it. Many a biographer would simply out of piety have pronounced the reason of that smile. I should not blame him for doing so ; but it was more than he could do as a biographer ; if he did, he would do it not as a biographer but as a spiritual writer. On the other hand, when a Saint is himself the speaker, he interprets his own action ; and that is what I find done in such fulness in the case of those early missionaries of the Church, to whom I am referring. I want to hear a Saint converse, I am not content to look at him as a statue ; his words are the index of his hidden life, as far as that life can be known to man, for "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." This is why I exult in the folios of the Fathers.

The view of a Saint here presented is one which most Protestants will find unfamiliar, and perhaps hard to enter into ; nor will anything in the book be more interesting to an open-minded Protestant than the impression it gives him of Dr. Newman's view of a Saint, and what is called "devotion" to him, the sort of veneration with which he is to be regarded, the sort of influence which his words and example are to exercise. In the following extract the same train of thought is pursued :—

I do not think lightly of the debt of gratitude which we owe to their biographers. It is not their fault if their Saint has been silent ; all that we know about him, be it much, be it little, we owe to them. Some of those Saints who have written most have told us least. There was St. Thomas ; he was called in his youth Bos Siculus for his silence ; it is one of the few personal traits which we have of him, and for that very reason, though it does but record the privation of which I am complaining, it is worth a good deal. It is a great consolation to know that he was the Bos Siculus ; it makes us feel a sympathy with him, and leads us to trust that perhaps he will feel some sympathy for us, who for one reason or other are silent at times when we should like to be speaking. But it is the sole consolation for that forlorn silence of his, since, although at length he broke it, to some purpose as regards theology and became a marvel (according to the proverb in such cases), still he is as silent as before in regard to himself. The Angel of the Schools ! how overflowing he must have been, I say to myself, in all bright supernatural visions and beautiful and sublime thoughts ! how serene in his contemplation of them ; how winning in his communication ! but he has not helped me ever so little in apprehending what I firmly believe about him... Biographers have done what they could. It would not have improved matters if they had been silent as well as the Saint ; still they cannot make up for their Saint's silence ; they do not deprive me of my grievance that at present I do not really know those to whom I am devout, whom I hope to see in heaven. A Saint's writings are to me his real life ; and what is called his "Life" is not the outline of an individual, but either of the *auto-saint* or of a myth.

The most complete and psychologically satisfactory sketch is that of Theodore; the most philosophical, and also to a general reader the most interesting, are those entitled "The Mission of St. Benedict," and the "Benedictine Schools." In these two articles Dr. Newman, taking St. Benedict as *par excellence* the organizer, if not the founder, of the monastic system, and his Order as the largest and most widely influential, gives us a theory, as it may be called, of the monk and his life in the earlier middle ages, showing how it aimed first of all and directly at quiet, peace, seclusion from worldly temptations, freedom from worldly entanglements, and how out of this grew naturally and necessarily other occupations not really inconsistent with this main object, though not contemplated by those who first sought it—the labours of agriculture, the duties of landowners, the copying and then the

editing and compiling of literary works, the education of the young. More recent monasticism has developed itself in lines that are really different ; and Dr. Newman takes as types of these Dominic and his Order, to whom he assigns the Scientific element, and Ignatius and his Order, to whom he assigns the Practical. St. Benedict and the great and many-branched Benedictine Order represents to him the Poetical—that is to say, the temper of mind which is the original and most truly and purely monastic ; the temper which listens, believes, reveres, wonders, meditates, loves, but does not attempt either to analyse or investigate logically on the one hand, or to govern and influence the world on the other ; the temper of children, the temper of simplicity and faith, alien from any sustained intellectual effort, be it either speculative or practical :—

The monastic state is the most poetical of religious disciplines. It was a return to that primitive age of the world of which poets have so often sung, the simple life of Arcadia or the reign of Saturn, when fraud and violence were unknown. It was a bringing back of those real, not fabulous, scenes of innocence and miracle when Adam delved, or Abel kept sheep, or Noe planted the vine, and angels visited them. It was a fulfilment in the letter of the glowing imagery of prophets about the evangelical period. Nature for art, the wide earth and the majestic heavens for the crowded city, the subdued and docile beasts of the field for the wild passions and rivalries of social life, tranquillity for ambition and care, divine meditation for the exploits of the intellect, the Creator for the creature—such was the normal condition of the monk. . . . Poetry I conceive, whatever be its metaphysical essence, or however various may be its kinds, whether it more properly belongs to action or to suffering—nay, whether it is more at home with society or with nature, whether its spirit is seen to best advantage in Homer or in Virgil—at any rate is always the antagonist to *Science*. As science makes progress in any subject-matter, poetry recedes from it. The two cannot stand together ; they belong respectively to two modes of viewing things, which are contradictory of each other. . . . The mission of science is to destroy ignorance, doubt, surmise, suspense, illusions, fears, deceits, according to the "Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas" of the poet, whose whole passage, by the way, may be taken as drawing out the contrast between the poetical and the scientific. But as to the poetical, very different is the frame of mind which is necessary for its perception. It demands as its primary condition that we should not put ourselves above the objects in which it resides, but at their feet ; that we should feel them to be above and beyond us, that we should look up to them, and that, instead of fancying that we can comprehend them, we should take for granted that we are surrounded and comprehended by them ourselves. It implies that we understand them to be vast, immeasurable, impenetrable, inscrutable, mysterious, so that at best we are only forming conjectures about them, not conclusions ; for the phenomena which they present admit of many explanations, and we cannot know the true one. Poetry does not address the reason, but the imagination and affections ; it leads to admiration, enthusiasm, devotion, love. The vague, the uncertain, the irregular, the sudden, are among its attributes or sources.

We have not space to follow Dr. Newman in working out this theory of the Benedictine life, and showing how the circumstances of Western Europe and the tendency to develop in new forms, natural to a great institution, led the Order into different kinds of activity from those simple ones of prayer and manual toil which its founder had contemplated. Although he deals here with a well-worn theme, his manner of illustrating by instances fills it with freshness and interest ; and he succeeds, we think, in showing that the classical learning of the monks, even in those darkest days which lie between the beginning of the seventh and the end of the eleventh century, was more considerable than most historians, and among them Mr. Hallam and Dean Milman, have been disposed to allow. Nor was their literary ability always so contemptible. Their prose had, to be sure, nothing classical in its structure, though they used to hunt out classical phrases with amusing care, and their verse was hopelessly rough and uncouth. But the matter was often weighty ; and even their lumbering hexameters (as in the case of Theodulf of Orleans and Florus the Deacon) sometimes display genuine poetical power.

Nor are we disposed, after having drawn so much pleasure from Dr. Newman's book, to enter on the ungracious task of controverting the arguments, or rather the suggested inferences, in favour of his own creed which lie scattered through it, albeit the avowal in his preface that his purpose is to some extent polemical might well warrant one in so doing. It is enough to remark that he proceeds throughout on the assumption, so constant in Roman Catholic writers, that because the outward appearance of historical continuity with the Church of the middle ages has been preserved by the Roman Catholic branch of the Christian community, therefore that branch in its modern form is the only true representative, not only of the Church of St. Francis and St. Thomas, but also of the Church of Alcuin and Charlemagne, of the Church of St. Basil, St. Augustine, St. Benedict ; that Protestants have no share in the glories or virtues of those ancient Saints, are no heirs of their spirit, are practically condemned by their example. The fact is that since the convulsion of the sixteenth century no section of the Church has been entitled to claim the sole heirship of the Church of the first ages, but some of its tendencies find themselves more fully represented in one place or sect, some in another. Modern Israel would be quite as well entitled to assert an exclusive right to Moses and the authors of those Psalms which are the basis of Christian worship as are Roman Catholics to the early Fathers. Again, as respects the argument from primitive practice in favour of certain forms of asceticism, and in particular of a monastic life, it is not necessary for Protestants to deny that they were then useful and that there is still much to admire in their spirit. In modern society it may be otherwise, and, so far from being useful, they may possibly produce greater evils than they were originally intended to meet. And, as a Pope suppressed that Society of Jesus which his predecessors had found so valuable an ally, so it is open to

[February 21, 1874.]

any one to hold that all organized religious Orders may deserve suppression, the mischiefs arising from such organization exceeding the benefits. However, it is no part of our present object to argue this question; and those who will most appreciate and enjoy Dr. Newman's admirable gifts of thinking and writing will not be those most likely to be swayed by the dogmatical inferences which he might wish them to draw, but will rather feel that there is more in common between him and them than either he or they would at first have been disposed to allow.

THE TREASURY OF LANGUAGES.*

WE were not prepossessed in favour of this book by a fly-leaf, in which the publishers "respectfully request a favourable consideration for the accompanying volume," and go on to tell us that "this compilation is the work of a literary amateur, and while liable to error, will yet be found an industrious and faithful repertory," and so on. We do not like any attempts to bias the independent decision of the judge; we do not like them the more because their effect, so far as they have any effect, is sure to be to bias the judge in the opposite way to that which is wished. If authors or publishers send us their books, it is because they wish us to give our opinion of their books; it is therefore absurd and impertinent to attempt to cajole us into giving something which shall not be our unbiased opinion. No one has a right to ask us to give "a favourable consideration" to any book; words which, if they mean anything, can only mean a request to speak of the book more favourably than it deserves. "Amor" and "favor" used to be disclaimed in oaths as much as "timor" and "odium," and our attorneys' bills no longer contain a payment "pro favore vicecomitis." We do not care what the author of a book is, whether a "literary amateur"—whatever that may be—or anything else. We fully feel that, like the literary amateur, like everybody else within our knowledge, we are "liable to error"; but we shall at least always speak of books, favourably or unfavourably—that is, in plain English, well or ill—according as the best of our skill and understanding leads us to think well or ill of them; and we shall certainly not speak or think better of them because we are asked to give them a favourable consideration. All that we can promise is that we will try not to let impertinence of this kind make us speak or think worse of them; the temptation to be striven against certainly lies on that side.

There are one or two other things which we should like to know more about arising out of the short "Advertisement" which follows the title-page, as this curious fly-leaf goes before it. We are there told that

acknowledgment is most justly due to Messrs Bagster and Sons, for permission to use the literary matter of their interesting and instructive volume, the "Bible in Every Land;" and to Messrs. Longmans and Co., for a like favour with regard to Dr. Latham's "Elements of Comparative Philology," a laborious, learned, and useful book, without which the present volume could not have been produced.

This is at any rate better than some people who copy whole pages of other people's books without so much acknowledgment as this, and who sometimes get quoted and praised for the matter which they have in this fashion stolen. Still we should like to know the exact meaning of the word "use" in this extract; and, though we have not very much faith in Dr. Latham, and though, among his many works we do not at this moment remember the one which bears the exact title of "Elements of Comparative Philology," still Dr. Latham has certainly reached a stage at which one would have thought he should no longer be patted on the back by a "literary amateur" as having written "a laborious, learned, and useful book." Directly after we read:—

The compiler readily apologises for any defects in his matter and manner; and takes this opportunity to thank his respected contributors, hereby exonerating them from any responsibility except for their own signed articles.

What is here the meaning of "respected contributors"? Does it mean people who have contributed, or only people who have been laid under contribution? Did the "respected contributors" really send something to the "literary amateur" for him to put in his book? or does it simply mean that pieces of their writings have been taken and marked with their names or initials? Now nobody quarrels with this last process within certain reasonable bounds. In Murray's Handbooks, for instance, to take the first case which comes into our head, it is very common to see rather full extracts from various writers with the names of those writers put at the end. We can bear witness that, in some cases at least, the writers' leave was never asked; but we can also bear witness that the writers have been rather pleased than displeased at being thus made use of. But they would have thought it rather queer if, on the strength of this, Mr. Murray or his editor had called them his "respected contributors," and had said that he "hereby exonerated them from any responsibility" for the rest of the text of Murray's Handbook. Then we are next told that "a list of signatures and writers will be found in the Appendix." But when we look at the end we find indeed a "list of contributors," but we also find that "the Appendix is necessarily postponed," and that "it will be proceeded with so soon as an adequate list of subscribers shall be obtained" for a second volume. When we look to the list of contrib-

utors, we find some names which are familiar to us and some names which are not, and Mr. Skeat, who, for all purposes within this island, is far at the top of the tree. And as we look through the book itself we see some very good sayings of Mr. Skeat and others, cheek by jowl with some very poor sayings, which we suppose came from the "literary amateur" himself. Some people seem not to know that a thing is only right when it is in the right place. But as, if you mix clean and muddy water, the whole is muddy and not clean, so if you put together alternate layers of sense and nonsense, the whole thus formed is nonsense, and not sense. But before we give some specimens of the Mezenian way in which the "literary amateur" has dealt with Mr. Skeat and his other respected contributors, we will first cast one more glance to the beginning of the book, where we find several pages called "Introduction on the Geographical Distribution of Languages," which we are told is "chiefly from Dr. Latham," but which bears at the end the initials "J. B." which in the list of contributors is explained to mean "James Bonwick, Esq., F.R.G.S., &c., &c." As no reference is given to any of Dr. Latham's many works, we have no means of knowing how much of this introduction is Latham and how much is Bonwick. We maintain that this is a way in which neither Dr. Latham nor anybody else ought to be treated. At the same time in the case of Dr. Latham there is certain Nemesis about it, for we have not forgotten the story of *Hore Ferales*, how we paid our money for so much Kemble, and got so much Latham instead.

The Dictionary seems to be meant to explain the technical terms of philology, and also to give some little account of various languages, but the formulae used are sometimes very odd. We take the first page, and the first article in it we there find:—

AACHEN.

A sub-dialect of low German or PLATT-DEUTSCH, vernacular at Aix-la-Chapelle, Lower Rhine.

ABANTES.

An extinct form of speech, classed as THRACO-ILLYRIAN, formerly vernacular in the I. of Eubaea, now called Negropont or Egripus, in the Grecian Archipelago.

ABBEVILLE.

A sub-dialect of FRENCH, vernacular in Picardy.

As for the Abantes, whose tongue was formerly vernacular in Eubaea, it is at any rate a good while ago since it was spoken; as for the places nearer home, we must explain that Aachen and Abbeville are the names of cities, and not of languages; and that Aachen and Aix-la-Chapelle are the German and French for the same city. The "literary amateur" seems to think that Aachen is the name of a dialect spoken at Aix-la-Chapelle, and that Abbeville is the name of a dialect spoken in Picardy. Perhaps however this may be only a blundering way of expression, one of the "defects in his manner" for which "the compiler readily apologizes." We will therefore go on to some examples of the "matter," and that specially on points that concern ourselves and our near kinsfolk and acquaintance. Turning over a few pages we come to Anglo-Saxon. We will here quote the whole article:—

A compound language formed by the union of several tribes of Teutonic origin, who conquered and settled in Britain, about A.D. 449, thence called England. The language is of cognate origin with the ALEMANNIC and GOTHIC; but with accretions from the SCANDINAVIAN and LOW DUTCH.

* What is called ANGLO-SAXON is really the oldest form of ENGLISH. The Anglo-Saxon of the first period extends from A.D. 450 to A.D. 1100; that of the later period from A.D. 1100 to about A.D. 1250; after which date we arrive at early Middle English. The specimens of the literature are too numerous to require mention. See the dictionaries by Lye and Manning, Bosworth, Grein, Etymological, and the list of MSS. in Hickes's "Thesaurus," vol. iii.

W. W. S., we need hardly say, means Mr. Skeat. But what can be more cruel than to tie on this clear and accurate fragment of Skeat to the confused rubbish of the former paragraph, doubtless the genuine work of the "literary amateur" himself? We are never surprised at people putting the wrong thing; what we never can understand is when people put the right and the wrong thing side by side, and seem to think that they can somehow agree.

Mr. Skeat is as hardly dealt with when we get to quite another tongue. After giving a fair definition of "Romance or Romanic" as "a class name for all modern languages derived from Latin," though among the "chief" we find Wallachian and Romansch, but not Provençal, we come to the following:—

ROMANCE, ROMAUNT, OR ROMAN.

A name awkwardly used as equivalent to PROVENÇAL, or the LANGUE d'Oc of South France; thus Raynouard's Dicty. of Provençal is called "Lexique de la Langue Roman." W. W. S. See ROMAINE.

We look with some difficulty for Romaine, and we find the same entry *mutatis mutandis* for the Langue d'Oïl which we before had for the Langue d'Oc, and with Roquefort substituted for Raynouard. The title for Roquefort's book, by the way, is not "Glossaire de la Langue Romaine," but "Romaine," and Raynouard was still further from such a strange concord as "Langue Romaine." It looks as if the "literary amateur" had got hold of some remark of Mr. Skeat's about the confusion caused by using the word Romance as a special name for either Provençal or Old-French, and had jumbled it up in this kind of way. But more than this, we get in different parts of the book the five following entries which must be taken together:—

CHURWELSCHÉ.

A sub-dialect of ROMANESE or ROMANIC, spoken in the Engadine or Valley of the Inn, Canton Grisons, S.E. Switzerland. Also called RHETO-ROMANIC.

* It is rich in Keltic, whence its name, "Welsche," i.e. "foreign." W. S. W. V.

* The Treasury of Languages. A Rudimentary Dictionary of Universal Philology. London: Hall & Co.

ENGADINO OR ENGHADINE.

A variety of the Romanese or Romance family, derived from *LATIN*; it is a dialect of the Grisons or Graubünden of Switzerland, vernacular on the head waters and upper course of the R. Inn; it is subdivided into two dialects, the upper and lower.

LADINICHE, LADINO.

ROMANCE: called also Upper and Lower ENGHADINE. It is a corruption of *LATIN*, spoken in the valley of the Inn, on the confines of Switzerland with the Tyrol and Italy.

RHAETO-ROMANIC.

Same as *CHURWALSCH*; name for the *patois* of La Suisse Romane as spoken in the Rhætian Alps.

So under "Swiss Romance," we find "same as Rhaeto Romanic."

ROMANA, ROMANESE, RUMONSCHE.

A modification of *LATIN*, including upper and lower ENGHADINE, vernacular in the Grisons, Swiss Alps.

This last has brought us to the immediate neighbourhood of the entries with which we were dealing just before. Altogether the jumble is about as fine as it could be. Does the compiler know that Graubünden and Grisons are two names for the same thing, and that, in the sense in which he uses the words, Rætian Alps and Swiss Alps must also be two names for the same thing? But when we remember how St. Lucius became a Swiss Bishop, perhaps nothing better is to be hoped for from literary amateurs. Still we should have thought that even a literary amateur might have known that what he is pleased to call the "Patois of La Suisse Romane"—that is, we suppose, the Cantons of Vaud, Geneva, and Neuchâtel—is not Churwelsch or Rhæto-Romanic, but simply Provençal; the same, we suppose, which in another article, under the head "Swiss," is called "a Patois of French." But even these flounderings of the compiler himself are outdone by the respected contributor who signs himself "W. S. W. V." initials which are explained in the list of contributors, W. S. W. Vaux, Esq., M.A., F.R.S. This is, if we mistake not, the same Mr. Vaux who a good many years ago wrote a book about Nineveh and Persepolis, in which the world was told "that the veteran Belisarius led the armies of the Empire against Justin and Tiberius, and was rewarded for his valour by the conquest of Dara and plunder of Syria." Those were the grand old days of blundering, when people went and lived twenty years in the East, and came back to explain that John Zimiskes was a Bulgarian King. But even then there were those who remarked that Mr. Vaux's description of the wars of Belisarius was very much as if one should say that Lord Nelson led the fleets of England against Queen Victoria, and was rewarded for his valour by the plunder of Gibraltar. The smallest progress is better than standing still, and since those days Mr. Vaux seems to have learnt something. He has learnt that Welsh means strange. But the use to which he puts his knowledge is stranger than any form of Welsh itself. Because Welsh means strange, therefore Churwelsch, or whatever we are to call it, is called Welsh, because it is rich in Celtic. If Mr. Vaux has ever studied under M. Brachet, he must have learned that French is very poor in Celtic, yet French is called Welsh nevertheless. We will give only two specimens, both of which concern ourselves. English is thus defined:—

The vernacular language of the British Empire, peculiar to England; it is an offshoot from the *TEUTONIC*, formed directly from the *ANGLO-SAXON*, with an admixture of Norman-French, and closely allied to *FRISIAN* and other dialects of *PLATT* or *LOW-GERMAN*.

Then follows Mr. Skeat's division of the periods of English; but, to say nothing else, we are curious to know how a tongue which is peculiar to England can at the same time be the vernacular of the British Empire. Elsewhere West-Saxon is defined to be

Main dialect of *ANGLO-SAXON*, spoken in *Wessex*, and the South generally, while a distinct dialect, *NORTH-ANGLIAN* (*Northumbrian*), was spoken in the North.

This is signed "G. R.," which the list of contributors explains to be Mr. George Rawlinson. The Professor-Canon would thus seem to have swooped down for a second raid upon his own land, cheered perhaps by the success of his great discoveries about *Dame* and *Lady*. It is perfectly true that Northumbrian is a different dialect from West-Saxon. Giraldus found that out a long time ago; but a series of observers from Ralph Higden to Dr. Morris have marked the fact that there is an intermediate dialect which, if the Northumbrian was to be mentioned at all, should have been mentioned also. Having once got under the guidance of Mr. Rawlinson, we naturally looked to learn something about the Alarodians and the Orthocorybantes, with whom the Professor-Canon seems so much more at home than with such humdrum tongues as Greek, Latin, French, and English. But, alas, the Orthocorybantes are not in the Dictionary at all, and under "Alarodii" we find only a reference to "Urarda," which is a case of "This road goes nowhere," as "Urarda" is nowhere in the book.

We thought we had done; only, in looking for "Urarda," we stumbled on "Ungarn," which is described to be "Teutonic; High-German dialect of Hungary." Certainly when scholars like Mr. Skeat become, whether unwittingly or unwittingly, "respected contributors" to literary amateurs, they sometimes meet with very strange bedfellows.

GEIKIE'S GREAT ICE AGE.*

MR. JAMES GEIKIE has collected into a goodly volume a series of very able papers in which he has within the last few years put forth in the *Geological Magazine* his views as one of the upholders of the pre-glacial date of the range of human life as co-existent with the age of the drift deposits in these islands. Besides correlating and criticizing the different opinions advanced upon the subject by the leading representatives of various systems of geology, he has an explanation of his own to offer as regards the distribution of the palaeolithic gravels of these islands, which differs in many features from that which has hitherto been popularly held. Whilst treating primarily of Scotland, it has been his aim throughout to indicate the succession of climatic changes over an area of far wider extent, conveying as far as possible to the reader's mind an impression of the Glacial epoch including not Scotland alone, but also every glaciated region which has been carefully studied by geologists. Until it was clearly understood what the succession of changes during the Ice age really was, it was premature, he thought, to speculate upon the geological antiquity of those deposits which yield the earliest traces of man in Britain. The great difference which is seen between the fauna of undoubted post-glacial beds in Scotland, Northern England, Wales, and Ireland, and the cave-deposits and palaeolithic gravels of Southern England, had long been a puzzle to him and to other geologists alike. His studies have now brought his mind to the conclusion that none of the palaeolithic series of gravels are post-glacial, but that all must be relegated to pre-glacial or inter-glacial times. For their absence from the Northern districts he accounts by their having been swept out by confluent glaciers, as well as by the action of the sea during the period of great submergences of the land. Mr. Geikie further claims to have made it probable, while bringing forward his proofs of these propositions, that a wide land-surface existed after the disappearance of the ice-sheets from the British area before the period of great subsidence had begun. We had been led to fear, from communications to certain scientific serials bearing Mr. Geikie's name, that he was inclined to advocate the theory of convulsionism in geology in opposition to the ideas of uniform and unbroken sequence, of which Sir Charles Lyell has been the consistent and authoritative exponent. It is consequently with the greater satisfaction that we find him at the outset of his present work expressing his conviction that the deposits of this class, which were at one time "slumped together" and vaguely believed to represent a period of wild cataclysms and convulsions, are really the records of a long series of changes, each of which, as it were, flowed into the other. Apart from this guiding principle, which is scarcely less to be regarded as a postulate to be taken into the inquiry than as a conclusion arrived at by convergent trains of investigation, nothing like a consistent and harmonious lesson is to be made of the teaching of the geological record. Such gaps or incongruities as still remain in what we know of the book of nature must be clearly seen to lie in our own lack of material or of insight, not in any degree in the nonconformity of nature herself. However loose and incoherent may appear at first sight the scattered masses of matter which overlie the solid rocks of Scotland or the other mountainous series of these islands, it is only by viewing them in their natural correlation and harmony with similar accumulations covering vast areas throughout the whole northern regions of our hemisphere that Mr. Geikie sees his way towards determining what is the exact position in the geological records of those deposits which bespeak the earliest vestiges of human life. Having discovered, if possible, at what stage during these great climatic and geographical revolutions it is certain that man occupied Britain, the way is paved for arriving eventually at some approximately definite estimate of the antiquity of man in Western Europe.

According to this programme, it is Mr. Geikie's plan to blend into one great result the special evidences which have been adduced by geologists and archaeologists to prove the great antiquity of our race. The larger part of the work is naturally devoted to the phenomena of glacial action as shown by a careful study of the deposits, together with the causes which led in the first instance to the accumulation of the enormous glacial masses of which they are the *débris*, and to the ultimate disappearance of the ice. Starting from the discovery of scratched or striated stones in the valley drift, which were recognized by Robert Chambers and others as proofs of glacier action analogous to those familiar to travellers in Switzerland and other mountain regions, Mr. Geikie goes briefly but clearly through the process whereby the till or lower deposit of stiff and tenacious clay has been laid over the rocky framework of the country by the grinding and wearing action of ponderous glacier masses, enclosing within itself these grooved and striated stones, of which specimens are here engraved from the black shale, limestone, and clay iron-stone. No fossils are ever found in the till, a proof of its being neither of marine nor of lacustrine origin. The aspects presented by accumulations of this material, and the way in which they are found cut through by river action as in the case of the Greskin Burn, Dumfriesshire, together with the accompanying sections, make intelligible to the ordinary reader the phenomena of these deposits as well as of the later gravels and clays superimposed upon them. The rounded outlines of the hills and mountain slopes, like

* *The Great Ice Age, and its Relation to the Antiquity of Man*. By James Geikie, F.R.S.E., F.G.S., of H.M. Geological Survey of Scotland London : Isbister & Co. 1874.

those around Loch Doon, as emphatically illustrate a further aspect of nature which has been made the evidence of glacial action on a grand scale. It was not till Agassiz had boldly taken the lead that geologists saw their way to connect these phenomena with the action of glaciers, upon which theory soon followed that of the transportation of blocks and boulders by floating bergs of ice. Our author here takes a rapid survey of the successive and rival hypotheses advanced of late years to explain the formation and mode of action of glacial masses. From Forbes's theory of viscosity, and Tyndall's regulation theory based upon a principle of Faraday's, together with the mechanical difficulties started by the late Canon Moseley, he passes on to one of great ingenuity put forward by Mr. Croll, which combines what is most forcible and expressive in the other two. Heat, it is well known, can be transmitted through ice without the ice melting, and indeed without the temperature of the ice being raised. The heat is simply converted into a certain amount of energy which enables the molecules to overcome their tendency to assume the crystalline form. This energy passing on from one molecule to another, the mere act of freezing being tantamount to giving out heat, the result is a contraction of each molecule, and a consequent sinking in the instant of yielding under heat, followed by an expansion in the act of regulation. Now heat acts upon glaciers, not only directly from the sun, but also from warm winds and rain, from the comparative warmth of its own rocky bed, and not least from the friction engendered by its own motion. In summer-time warm water trickles and filters through innumerable cracks and fissures in the ice. Thus heat is rapidly and extensively transmitted through the glacier, each molecule as it yields under its modicum of warmth sinking downwards by virtue of its fluidity, but immediately resuming its solid form, upon which it expands, throwing back its heat to the following molecule, which in turn carries on the process. The result is a gradual movement of the whole mass downwards, as fluids and semi-fluids are urged by gravitation down a slope. Glacier motion is thus precisely that of running water, though retarded by the crystalline form which it assumes in the intervals of melting. Heat is after all the great lever which, with gravity for its fulcrum, forces the hard masses of compacted snow and ice from higher to lower levels, causing them to spread out down and along the clefts and gorges of the rocks, wearing away and polishing the surface below and on either side, embedding in the glacier mass the stones which fall upon its surface or which it wrenches from their beds, and with these for its tools scoring marks of its progress upon the hardest granite and limestone. Reaching the sea, the head of the great mass begins to float in virtue of its lighter specific gravity, breaks off with tremendous concussion, and drifts away a mighty berg, to drop, as it yields to the sun's rays, its freight of stone or sand, which shall one day be upborne to the surface as a boulder. Other blocks are left behind to strew the bed of the glacier as it contracts under a milder climate, the more bulky fragments gathering into moraines, and the more minute débris strewing valley and plain in the form of till and lighter deposits of clay and sand. Each step in the process is traced with admirable perspicuity and fulness by Mr. Geikie, illustrated by reference to the great theatres of nature where it is even now to be seen on the widest scale—Greenland and the Antarctic barrier. By the light of existing phenomena the glaciologist is in a condition to elucidate the action of similar physical causes in remote ages upon our own soil. Mr. Geikie's explanations, aided by his excellent topographical plans, showing the distribution of the hills and the valley deposits, with the range and direction of the strike and other marks of glacier action, supply the materials for a mental picture of Britain such as it appeared during the great Ice age.

The facts and arguments welded together by Mr. Geikie point to more than one period during which the aspect of the British Isles was that of Greenland, or at least of Switzerland. A period of general submergence, put by him at about twelve hundred feet in the region of the Fintry Hills, and some two hundred feet less towards the South-east of Scotland, succeeded the first glacial sheet, which had before this begun to shrink under a relaxation of the intense cold. A still severer climate, he considers, prevailed during the period of subsidence. Though the carrying powers of floating ice during this period have, he suspects, been greatly exaggerated, it is not difficult to trace by the innumerable erratics which sprinkle the valleys and plains what were the shores and the currents of the glacial sea. The sand, clay, shells, and other organisms embedded in these deposits no less bespeak their marine origin. The great lake system of Scotland presents us with another striking chapter in the history of the Ice age. Dismissing one by one the rival theories of the origin of lochs and rock-basins, Mr. Geikie gives his reasons for attributing them, with Professor Ramsay, to the eroding and scooping action of land ice. The lakes and fiords lie along the axes of great glaciers, the marks of whose grinding and wearing action may still be traced, notwithstanding the accumulations of river drift, gravel, and silt brought down by streams and rivers which have obscured the original rock-bound character of the lake-basins. Analogous phenomena are to be traced on a far vaster scale in Scandinavia. There the ice sheet seems to have reached a thickness of not less than six or seven thousand feet, the diverging marks of striation indicating a maximum elevation about the present head of the Gulf of Bothnia, the ice-cap not creeping, as some geologists have supposed, regularly outwards from the North Pole as from a centre. One of the most

striking phenomena of this region, which still remains very much a mystery after the researches of Forbes and the writer before us, is the height at which erratic blocks are met with above the rocks which apparently form their parent bed. In Scotland granite boulders are found at considerable heights; but at Areskutan blocks were seen by Törnebohm at a height of 4,500 feet, which could not possibly have come from any place higher than 1,800 feet. Another class of problem is presented in the formation of the *dsar*, or long winding ridges of detritus which form a kind of natural embankment to the height of fifty or one hundred feet, and show in maps like winding rivers or watercourses. After enumerating the many theories which have been started upon the subject, Mr. Geikie, though aware that the whole secret of their formation is far from being cleared up, inclines to see in the *dsar*, with the late Robert Chambers, a deposit analogous to the kames and eskers of our own island. They are alike devoid of fossils. Erratic blocks are frequently found perched upon them or sprinkled along their sides. A fine glacial clay containing arctic shells often covers the slopes of the *dsar*. All the evidence seems to point towards the fact that as the kames were laid down by the swollen rivers which poured from the retreating glacial sheet during the great thaw subsequent to the first Ice age, and were next during the period of submergence remodelled by the sea, without their stratification being disturbed, so in like manner are the *dsar* of Sweden no other than the denuded and partly re-arranged portions of old torrential gravel and sand or moraine débris. Although themselves of the strictly glacial period, these deposits have been largely overlaid by post-glacial clays, sands, and gravels, with organic remains interspersed, testifying to the elevation of the land, the mitigation of the arctic climate, and the presence of a new fauna in many respects represented by forms now living.

(To be continued.)

RIBBLESDALE.*

RIBBLESDALE would be a better novel if it read less like a blue-book, and a better blue-book if it read less like a novel. It is written in that ponderous but correct style which is only acquired by years of official labour. It contains a good deal of what is called valuable information on the state of Lancashire sixty years ago; but, on the other hand, its plots and its incidents are as unofficial and as worthless as anything that can be found in the pages of Mr. Harrison Ainsworth himself. Its composition reminds us of nothing so much as of that drink called three-threads which we read of in Boswell, which was made by mixing three different kinds of ale in equal parts in the same tankard. At last some ingenious brewer mixed the various ingredients of the three kinds all together in his vat, and sold the compound under the name of his Entire, to the great relief of the barman, who had only to draw from one tap instead of from three. Much the same kind of relief has Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth afforded to the reading public. Instead of reading first their Parliamentary blue-book, next the old historical novel of the school of G. P. R. James, and lastly the modern sensational novel, they can get an entire mixture of all three styles in the pages of *Ribblesdale*. We certainly have found the mixture rather heavy, and such as brought on drowsiness. But then we must own that, as we care for none of the three styles when taken apart, it is scarcely likely that we should care for them when mixed up together. The author is anxious that it should be understood "that the principal characters in these volumes are not portraits; and that the incidents never to his knowledge happened in any Lancashire family." The early Greek artists, as we read in our boyhood in the pages of our *Delectus*, used to write beneath their pictures, "This is a tree, this a house." Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth thinks it necessary to write beneath his, "These are not portraits, these are not true incidents." However needful it may have been in the beginning of art for the painter to inform the spectator that what he saw had some real existence, in these latter days there is surely not the least need for the novelist to inform the reader that what he reads of had no real existence. Let the author be reassured. No Lancashire man would any more suspect that his family history was worked into the story of *Ribblesdale* than a Cornishman would suspect that his family history was worked into the true and veracious history of Jack the Giant Killer.

We do not know that we have ever been more puzzled with a plot than in the present case, or ever felt more need of those genealogical tables which we have more than once urged our story-writers to give. We are to be sure in the best of company, though the heroine is only a manufacturer's daughter. But then she is an heiress, and comes in for half a million of money. But to make up for her lowly birth, we have lords and ladies, from dukes and duchesses downwards; among them a very wicked old Countess who is always called The Corsican, or The Corsican Grandmother. "She had not quailed before the sacrifice of her eldest son, in the most tragic manner and with true Corsican perfidy, to the pride of race and the ambition of family aggrandisement." The hero, Rufus Noel, who is the grandson of this old lady, and the supposed heir to the earldom, is always being warned "that the blood of the Corsican is in his veins," that his "race yields to the ideal, but its ideal changes," and that with it "the dream of youth has been crushed under foot in manhood, and become the remorse of

* *Ribblesdale; or, Lancashire Sixty Years Ago.* By Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, Bart. 3 vols. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1874.

age." In spite of all these warnings, Rufus perseveres in his suit to Alice Hindle, the manufacturer's daughter. He gains her, it is true, at last, and no harm comes of it, but that does not show in the least that the warnings were not needed, for before he gains her he loses his succession to the earldom. A rightful heir turns up, and Rufus, now that he is to remain a commoner, may, we suppose, without offending Fate or the Destinies, marry whom he pleases.

The book opens with a curious and interesting description of a Lancashire fair. In a street fight that takes place between the inhabitants of two hostile villages, the heroine, who is accompanying a poor lad, one John Spencer, to his dying uncle's bed, is rescued by Rufus Noel. A moment after up comes Alice's cousin, Robert Hindle, who is a suitor for her hand, and takes her home. But here our author shall speak for himself:—

She curtseyed, smiled sweetly on Rufus Noel, and, taking her cousin's arm, withdrew with him and John Spencer, leaving Rufus transfixed to the spot. The traditions of his family, the dreams of his youth, the purest of his emotions, had all been commingled in one lightning flash of revelation, which had vanished and left the blank of commonplace life before him.

"The Witch of Pendle and this Robert Hindle always rise up to vex my existence. She, the cancer corroding our life; he, with Saxon commonsense, endurance, and constancy, toiling like a tortoise, yet threatening to outstrip the hare. Almost making up for genius and cultivation by his iron frame and will, in our school rivalry. By his weight, wiry vigour, and dogged obstinacy, a match for pluck, science, and ardour. Can it be that this fair creature has given her love to such a man?"

He had clutched his chin with his hand, and was staring at vacancy, when a slight tap on the shoulder roused him.

The Witch of Pendle in the end turns out to be the widow of Lord Wentworth, the eldest son whom the Corsican Grandmother had sacrificed, and John Spencer turns out to be their child, the rightful Lord De la Legh. The Corsican, finding that her son would marry a girl below him in birth, Margaret Forrester, had given her consent provided the marriage service was celebrated in secret. She had procured a forged special licence and "suborned a man not being in holy orders to appear as a priest." This "malefactor" later on gets hanged, but first makes a full confession. Lord Wentworth dies; Margaret gives birth to a dead child, as she believes, goes half-crazy, and lives in a place called the Owl's Hole, where she is looked upon as a witch. She did not, however, forget the injury done her, and was determined "she would combat the wily and unscrupulous Corsican like Fate commissioned to punish." Happily, however, there are good Countesses as well as bad Countesses. The Contessa Rufolo, who passes at times in the story under the name of Kezia Spencer, had "substituted her own courier and his wife to represent Lord Wentworth and Margaret Forrester" at the marriage where the malefactor had acted as priest; while a few hours later the marriage between the real Lord and the real Margaret "was conducted by the Rev. Everard Varley, then incumbent of Curzon Chapel, Mayfair." The Contessa had been present also at the birth of the child, and pretending that it had been born dead, had stolen it away. This she had done partly to save the child's life, for she dreaded the plots of its Corsican grandmother, and partly as she "indulged the thought of producing him when of full age to claim his rights—ignorant and savage—the heir of the Noels." It is no wonder that when she made this confession of her motives, towards the close of the third volume, the Corsican "involuntarily hissed, 'Ah! the viper!' in a strange utterance of rage and horror." Meanwhile the Rev. Everard Varley had also turned out a scoundrel, and tearing out the leaf from the register in which the marriage was recorded, had fled with it to Australia. The flight agreeably varies the story, as it introduces us to criminals in a very different class of life from that of the Corsican. We get to bushrangers and a very low-born murderer, whose arrest is told at considerable length. In the end the lost page is recovered, all the villains confess their guilt, Margaret Forrester, as we have already said, turns out to be the relict of Viscount Wentworth, Kezia Spencer the Contessa Rufolo, Earl De la Legh simply Peregrine Edgar Noel, and John Spencer Earl de la Legh.

There was no doubt that John Spencer was the rightful heir, for he had on his shoulder-blade that well-known strawberry mark which all stolen heirs have, and which, according to *Box and Cox*, all long-lost brothers have not. Besides what nature had done for him in this respect, art had done something more. A young Italian surgeon who had attended the child at its birth, "urged by the Contessa in her presence and that of the nurse, had marked the child by tattooing a small Maltese cross in the arm-pit." Besides this, "he added three small spots opposite particular vertebrae of the spine." With good reason had the Corsican, when a day or two before these grand disclosures she saw in the *Times* the arrival of the person from Australia, exclaimed, "There it is! Oh, my prophetic spirit! I foreboded it. So! they will have me at bay! Let them have a care!" When all comes out she makes away with herself by means of a mysterious ring which one of her mysterious agents, Riva, had thus mysteriously got for her:—

"When we were last in Rome, she said to me one day, 'They tell me there is an aged man in the Ghetto who has a precious ring with a large diamond and two small turquoises. He lives at No. 84 in the Ghetto. Seek him out. Show him this parchment, otherwise he will not let you see the ring. Ask him its price. Let me know; I intend to buy it.' I went, my Lord. I found a man, very old, but with eyes as bright as carbuncles, and a nose so hooked that it nearly met his prominent chin, for all his teeth were gone. I gave him the parchment. He took a fluid and washed it, then he showed me a name 'Cesare Borgia.' He brought the ring out of an iron safe. He explained to me how to manage it. Under the great diamond was a reservoir of the subtlest poison. There was a hair tube on each side controlled by the turquoises. These, when pressed and moved aside, opened the tube and a drop of the poison exuded. I asked the price.

"The price," he said, "has been paid by him who brings the parchment, except a gratuity to the custodian." I gave him a liberal gratuity, and brought away the ring. Her ladyship tried the effect of a drop of the poison on a large St. Bernard dog. The dog showed no sign of illness for some hours. Then he was rather sleepy. He staggered when he walked. He fell into a deep sleep uttering little howls. When he woke he had no power over his hind legs, and in two days he died. A slow but sure poison."

It is a wonderful relief when this old lady does at last poison herself off. She was ever "muttering in a monologue," or indulging in reveries, and her monologues and her reveries were of vast length. On one occasion, the author writes, "her reveries might be summarized somewhat as follows:—'So De la Legh has thrown off the slough of the Sybarite with its glittering scales. The true blood asserts itself in action!'" and so on for a whole page. On other occasions he does not take the trouble to summarize even as much as this. Wonderful as are the monologues and the reveries, scarcely less wonderful are the dialogues. As we read them we feel that they ought to have been spoken before the foot-lights. We grieve over the great waste of dramatic power, for out of this one novel the author might have made a baker's dozen of melodramas. How well would the actors who so lately played *Antony and Cleopatra* at Drury Lane have given out such a dialogue as the following between Earl Castlemaine and his daughter:—

"But he is not dead!"

"No sir, he is not dead; he lives. Is there a fatal fascination in this race? He seems to me a substitute for Wentworth, whom I must have loved, or his memory would not revive with so sharp a pang."

"Then, Guendoline, be mistress of yourself. Do not let the mere form and semblance of Wentworth possess your fancy. Do not shrink from the mere apparition of an early prepossession."

"I will command myself, father. I was surprised, overset. But forewarned, I have a man's nerves. Now I am forewarned."

"You are my beloved daughter. The sooner we are away from this house the better."

"Nay, father, gratify my weakness in one thing. Await the report of the surgeon."

"I will, Guendoline; but it will be midnight before we reach Greta Castle."

Ponderous as is the talk between this nobleman and his daughter, far more ponderous is the talk between the lovers. It is as if each had been provided with set speeches out of the *Enfield Speaker*, and delivered them as schoolboys did when they took the parts of Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox. As we read these lovers' talk we were reminded of the prints in this book on oratory, in which were shown the various postures which should be taken by each speaker in the course of the delivery. If love used to be made after that fashion sixty years ago in Lancashire, there must have been a good deal of spare time in which to make it. Doubtless, with the vast improvement in their machinery, they have learnt in these more modern days to throw off not only their yarn, but their love, at a greater rate.

The author makes one or two errors in writing of the early parts of this century which are curious in a writer who is describing, as he tells us, times which he can himself remember. He introduces the Manchester police and detectives, a reformatory for girls, Radicals, and athletics in the University. He makes Lord De la Legh come home from the Mediterranean by way of Marseilles during the great French war. However, the story is in itself so monstrously improbable that such minor matters as these are scarcely worthy of notice.

THE VENETIAN ARCHIVES.*

THE fifth volume of Venetian despatches takes us over twenty-one years, nearly as long a period of time as was occupied by the three preceding volumes. From this it may be inferred that the documents in the Venetian Archives which refer to England are more scanty during the latter years of the reign of Henry VIII. and that of his successor Edward VI. than for the first twenty-five years of that reign. But, though fewer, they are by no means less important. Almost from the first page down to the last there appears something which throws light upon obscure points of history, and throughout the volume there are incidents related which will enable readers to confirm, or it may be in many cases considerably to modify, the opinions they had formed of the character and conduct of royal and other personages who figure in the history of the period. For instance, the character of Cardinal Pole has been hotly contested, and it seems to us that Protestant historians have done but little justice to his memory. We are not aware that Mr. Rawdon Brown has ever committed himself to an unfavourable opinion of the Cardinal. But if he has, he has amply atoned for it by even going something out of his way, in his interesting preface, in the eulogy which he has thought fit to bestow upon him. Without giving the proofs of Pole's integrity and high breeding with which the volume abounds, and which would occupy many pages even in the briefest analysis, we shall content ourselves with referring our readers to the preface itself, and if they have time and inclination to read so much, to the whole volume, in evidence of the truth of the opinion Mr. Rawdon Brown has pronounced, in which we entirely concur, never having had the least doubt that the character and conduct of the last Cardinal

* Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to English Affairs existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in other Libraries of Northern Italy. Vol. V., 1534-1554. Edited by Rawdon Brown. Published by the authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. London: Longmans & Co. 1873.

Archbishop of Canterbury was that of a perfect Christian gentleman.

At the commencement of the volume Carlo Capello is the Venetian Ambassador in England, and the papers of the first seventeen months conclude with the account of England and its institutions which, according to custom, he read at the Senate upon his return. Several of these reports have found their way into print, and one extremely valuable description of English affairs was printed by Mr. Rawdon Brown in his fourth volume. Capello's report is of very inferior interest, and is much shorter than these documents usually are. This is in part accounted for by the fact that the recalled Ambassador was still suffering from the effects of an illness which had nearly killed him on his homeward journey, and partly by an omission made by the scribe who took down his speech. It is unfortunate that the part omitted contained an account of the life and character of Cromwell. So little is known of Cromwell's early career, that the Venetian Ambassador's address would probably have contained valuable information on this point. As it stands at present, nothing more is said of him than that he was a person of low origin and condition who had risen to the possession of supreme authority as Prime Minister and Secretary of State. The transcriber of the speech observes that there was no allusion made either to the late or the present Cardinal, perhaps scarcely understanding the policy of silence on such a subject—Wolsey having died in disgrace, and Fisher being in prison, daily expecting to be beheaded. The most valuable piece of information contained in the address consists in the reference to the Royal Family. And the expression of opinion of an unprejudiced bystander must be taken for what it is worth—and it appears to us to be worth a good deal—in the estimate that is to be formed as to the popularity of the King's measures after the final separation from Rome. He says that the King was so unpopular that a rebellion might break out any day and cause great confusion, and that he marvels how he should have fallen into so many errors and false tenets, considering his rare endowments both of mind and body. The old Queen Catharine was in a bad way and altogether neglected, whilst the King was tired to satiety of this new Queen—*i.e.* Anne Boleyn. In less than twelve months the old Queen had died peaceably in her bed and the new one on the scaffold.

The letters in this part of the volume are short, and do not contain much that is important. But there is one very remarkable document, the insertion of which we cannot affect to regret, although it is absolutely unconnected with English affairs, and has therefore no business whatever to appear in this volume. It purports to be an information given to the King of the Romans by the Archbishop of Cologne, the Elector of Saxony, and the Duke of Cleves, as to the excesses committed by the Anabaptists at Münster, and contains a history of one of the most remarkable delusions that have ever in modern times originated a religious sect. Amongst other absurdities, too many to be here enumerated, there is mentioned the belief of these fanatics in four prophets, two of whom were just and two unjust—namely, David and John the tailor of Leyden for the former, Luther and the Pope for the latter; but of the two they thought Luther was the worst. The only other document of this year which is worth noticing is the Report of France by Marin Giustinian, son of the more celebrated Sebastian Giustinian, who was Venetian Ambassador in England during 1515—1519. Like Capello's, it is unusually short, unless it has been much abridged in the analysis. It states with considerable accuracy the mutual relations of the three Powers—England, France, and the Empire—and mentions as a reason for the fear of England entertained by France, that ten Englishmen are a match for twenty Frenchmen.

Amongst the documents of the year 1537 there is a narrative of a conversation held by Lorenzo Bragadino, the Venetian Ambassador at Rome, with the Pope, which shows the estimate Paul III. had formed of his predecessor. The Pope, after complaining of the perpetual quarrels between the Emperor and Francis which prevented the joint action of Christendom against the Turks, added with reference to Charles:—"This is not the way to resist Sultan Solyman, separating Christendom from France, which has so much power and authority and military forces and money which are needed for this undertaking, unless it be that the Emperor would fain effect our total overthrow; for he it was who has been the cause of our losing England, as, had he not promised to attack King Henry, Clement would not have published the sentence" (p. 53). The Pope also complained of the Emperor for being the cause of the increase of the Lutherans, whom he might have extinguished at the time of his election when the sect was insignificantly small; whereas both then and afterwards, when the Augsburg Confession had been presented, he had allowed them too much liberty in following their own fashions.

The Pope had only recently elevated Pole to the Cardinalate, and the volume is here very full of letters from Pole to various correspondents referring to this subject. It is of course a convenience to reviewers not to have to refer to Querini for these; but we cannot help thinking that the analysis of papers already printed in books easily accessible is superfluous, and tends to swell these volumes inordinately. Querini's Collection is a book known to every one who pretends to any acquaintance with the history of the period, and the space occupied by the analysis of the letters contained in it would have been better filled by a fuller description of the new letters of Pole's which now appear for the first time.

We next come to the year 1540, where we find one of the earliest intimations of the coming divorce from Anne of Cleves.

Dr. Lingard has exposed the farce through which Convocation and Parliament were forced to go by the King, who had a letter written by the Council to Clerk, Bishop of Bath and Wells, the Ambassador at the Emperor's Court, describing the whole thing three days before it took place. Contarini had come to the same conclusion, when, July 29, he wrote that "the King of England has, in fact, made his bishops declare that by no contract can the sister of the Duke of Cleves be his wife." He adds in the same letter "that the sentence was passed by the bishops on Saturday, and that the King on the following day married Catherine Howard, who was already pregnant by him." We may observe, however, that Contarini's dates are not absolutely correct here, nor perhaps his facts. A few weeks earlier, writing to the Signory from Bruges, describing Clerk's arrival at the end of June, and in another letter of July 17, speaking of the mission of Clerk, he says:—

The cause is said publicly to be that his Majesty purposes repudiating even this last wife, the sister of said Duke of Cleves, because he had promised marriage to another woman, Maid of Honour to the deceased Queen, as you must have heard in detail from your secretary in England.—P. 85.

That the divorce of Anne of Cleves was precipitated by the desire to gain Catharine Howard for a wife has always been taken for granted; but what truth there may be in the Venetian Ambassador's representation of the case it is impossible to say, though he speaks of the fact as being so notorious that it must have been reported to the Signory from their Ambassador resident in London. Contarini further moralizes on the subject by comparing it with the case of the Landgrave of Hesse. We give this little bit of scandal as we find it, simply observing that it confirms an accusation which has been before now brought against the Landgrave, though Protestant historians have attempted to represent it as false. He says:—

The Landgrave has a beautiful and most amiable wife, the daughter of the late Duke George of Saxony. She is a good Catholic, and has borne him four children. But the Landgrave, being enamoured of a very beautiful girl in the service of his wife, importuned his wife to enter a convent, representing that he was eaten up by the French disease, and unwilling to communicate it to her. As she would not consent to this, he at length sent to consult Martin Luther and his companions, who stated their opinion that his lordship might take this damsel likewise to wife, as no divine law exists prohibiting polygamy, but the Old Testament, on the contrary, affords many instances of a plurality of wives. Your Serenity will thus perceive into how many errors, one greater than another, those who commence deviating from the Catholic faith precipitate themselves.—P. 86.

There is one other point in the reign of Henry VIII. upon which the documents contained in these papers throw some light. Cardella, in his Lives of the Cardinals (Vol. IV., p. 191), gives an account of the mission of a Bolognese officer named Lodovico da l'Armi from Henry VIII. to Trent for the purpose of assassinating Cardinal Pole. In a book more accessible to English readers—namely, Phillips's "Life of Pole"—the same accusation is brought against the King; but the particulars are not related, several attempts to murder the Cardinal by different persons, instigated, as is alleged, by the King, being referred to without any specification of date, and with very slight description of circumstances, Da l'Armi's name not being even mentioned by this author. The Venetian Calendar, however, of the year 1545–6 is full of this man's name, which is mentioned nearly a hundred times. The first mention we have of him is in January 1545. His arrival at Venice is reported by Harvel, January 25, and the ostensible purpose of his mission was the "making men for the King's Majesty." After this it occurs again in a minute of a despatch from the King to Harvel, in which Henry tenders his thanks to Da l'Armi for the diligent service he has done for the advancement of his affairs. The date of this despatch is March 30, 1545. In his acknowledgment of this letter, Harvel mentions Da l'Armi, and towards the end of his letter gives the King the information that Pole had not yet left Rome for Trent, but had sent on two of his servants in disguise, one of them pretending to be the Cardinal himself. Harvel says, "I know not to what purpose such folly should be used." Nothing can be plainer from the turn of the whole Venetian correspondence relating to this man than that the Pope suspected he had a design on Pole's life. The Venetian Signory had some trouble in reconciling their duty to the Pope, who wanted them to banish Da l'Armi from their territory, with their fear of offending the King of England, whose servant they had allowed, contrary to their usual practice, to levy soldiers in their dominions. In August this year a circumstance occurred which gave the Chief of the Ten a very good plea for complying with the Pope's request. Da l'Armi and his men seem to have been engaged in several brawls at night, in one of which they assaulted the city patrol, and wounded one of the men, thus incurring the penalty of death if the crime could be proved. We are not concerned with the exact details of the story, the English version of which may be read in Harvel's Despatch in the State Papers, Vol. X. p. 563), and the Venetian account in the letter written by the Chiefs of the Ten to their secretary in England. The issue of the matter was that Da l'Armi was in his absence sentenced to perpetual banishment and to death if ever he should appear again in the dominions of Venice; and that the King, not caring to lose the services of the man whom he had hired for the purpose of murdering Pole, remonstrated with the Council on the severity of their judgment, and petitioned that he should be allowed to remain at Venice. The King condescended to repeat his request that Da l'Armi should still be allowed to reside in Venetian dominions for five years. The petition was heard and unanimously rejected December 4, and again December 9; but the decision seems to have been reversed by a large majority the same

day, and on the next day the new Doge, Francisco Donato, wrote to the King giving the required allowance. Whether this urgency on the part of the King of England had anything to do with the secret purpose must of course remain a mystery to be decided one way or the other according to the estimate the reader may form of the King's character. Da l'Armi arrived at Brussels and told his story with such excuses as he could to the Venetian Ambassador at that Court, who of course retailed it to the Signory. He thence proceeded to England, from which he was sent in March following on a second mission to the Venetian territory, the Council of Trent at that time holding its first sessions. In the course of the year he was again arrested for being implicated in a murder of a Venetian citizen at Ravenna. He made his escape from Venice, but was arrested at Milan just after the death of the King of England; but the authorities at Milan seem to have been most unwilling to be implicated in the case, owing to their fear of the King of England. He was afterwards by the order of the Emperor surrendered to take his trial at Venice, and was sent there April 29, and executed May 14. We are not concerned with Da l'Armi's history any further, and indeed have only mentioned his case at all because of the relation it bears to the charge against Henry of having concerted the assassination of Cardinal Pole. And whatever may have been the weight of evidence to implicate the King in this crime, the accounts given in the Venetian despatches certainly add to that weight. Da l'Armi was monster enough to have perpetrated such a deed. Whether Henry was wicked enough to have hired him for the purpose will be judged differently according to the estimate the reader may have formed of the character of the King of England.

We have confined our attention to the reign of Henry VIII., which scarcely occupies one-third of the volume. We must not conclude without calling attention to the very important despatches of the year 1531, which, properly speaking, belong to the preceding volume, but which, having come to hand too late for insertion there, have been consigned to an Appendix.

MEETING THE SUN.*

THIS book is remarkable externally for one of the most hideous and startling covers that it has ever been our lot to behold. On a ground of bright yellow two mysterious flourishes in red, resembling nothing so much as those triumphs of calligraphy which used to be designed by simple-minded schoolmasters, represent a dragon and a phoenix. We should have taken them for a Chinese version of the lion and unicorn fighting for the crown, which last object is suggested by a mysterious circular figure in gold. Mr. Simpson, however, informs us in his preface that the whole design is intended to symbolize the marriage of the Emperor of China, which is the principal event commemorated in his pages. Internally, we are happy to add, the lover of art will find something better. The book contains a number of spirited illustrations, which have been reproduced by the heliotype process from woodcuts in the *Illustrated London News*. Mr. Simpson, in fact, was the Correspondent of that newspaper and of the *Daily News* on the occasion of the Imperial marriage. The letters which he wrote to one of the papers form the letterpress which accompanies the illustrations. It may perhaps be said without offence that newspaper correspondence does not often bear reproduction. In fact, when a man is obliged to fill a certain number of pages with the best material that offers itself, it is scarcely possible that the interest should not occasionally be rather thin. Now Mr. Simpson is a thoroughly competent Correspondent; he has been in many parts of the world and gone through some interesting experiences; he has travelled in Thibet, been in the Crimean war, and at the Abyssinian Expedition; and, in short, is an excellent specimen of that class of traveller who does not explore unknown countries, but is sure to turn up in any corner of the world from Paris to Peking where any exciting events are being transacted. And yet we must in candour add that Mr. Simpson with all his experience has not quite learnt the art of making bricks without straw. The letters were doubtless interesting at the time; but a good many of them have become rather flat. The book has therefore the rather serious fault that there is a good deal too much of it. There are, as we shall presently show, some very good chapters; but a severe critic might possibly be inclined to condemn a great many pages as very little better than respectable padding. The author has, however, the merit of pointing out to persons with a few months to spare how they may employ their time, and see a great many curious things which are not as yet completely hackneyed. A man of literary and artistic tastes would probably prefer to spend a long holiday in visiting the civilized world, and making himself acquainted with the accumulated treasures of the great European centres. But then many people, otherwise of highly estimable character, have no artistic or literary tastes. They would often do more to enlarge their minds by travelling round the world than by lounging in churches and picture galleries, of which the higher meanings do not reveal themselves to the uninitiated. A very interesting tour may be made, and doubtless will soon become popular, by visiting the Suez Canal, dropping in for a few days upon India, catching a glimpse of the Great Wall of China, ascending Yoko-hama, crossing the Pacific, visiting the Yosemite Valley, and

returning home by way of the Salt Lake City. If that programme is carried out within a few months, a man cannot expect to penetrate very deeply below the surface; but if he is a fairly good observer, and has some hobby to secure food for thought, he will probably come home with a few new ideas. We have sketched the general outline of Mr. Simpson's book. We will add that he has the qualifications which we have suggested. He can see things as a man is likely to see them who has a quick command over his pencil; and though he does not go very deeply into social or archaeological questions, he has a hobby in the study of temples, and is fond of various social and historical inquiries which make him an agreeable companion. We could have spared his account of a voyage down the Red Sea in a P. and O. steamboat, for, if we are not mistaken, we have read very much the same narrative several times already. We doubt whether he got far below the surface of Chinese life during the few weeks of his stay. But if we do not make unfair demands we can turn over his pages in very good temper, and part with him on excellent terms.

Omitting all mention of the less interesting parts of his book, we may come at once to the marriage of the Chinese Emperor. Various travellers have remarked that the inhabitants of the Celestial Empire are not so far wrong as we are inclined to flatter ourselves in their contempt for the outside barbarians. We do not assert, nor does Mr. Simpson, though a friendly observer, maintain, that they are at a higher stage of civilization than ourselves. But it is true that, if we have some things to teach them besides the consumption of opium, we might take a few hints in return. Amongst these we should be strongly inclined to reckon the mode of conducting State marriages. Mr. Simpson, looking at the matter from a professional point of view, is naturally inclined to find fault with their whimsical inversion of the European practice. We, regarding the same question from the point of view of readers instead of writers of newspaper reports, feel that they have much to say for themselves. When an Emperor is married there is of course a grand procession. The Chinese, however, instead of calling upon all the world to look on, have their processions in the middle of the night, and barricade all the approaches to the street in which it is to take place. The consequence is that very much less opportunity is given for graphic delineations of the scene, and that everything is done with the utmost privacy. We reckon this as an advantage; but Mr. Simpson, who went all the way round the world to witness the ceremony, naturally considered himself to be rather injured. However the Correspondent is irrepressible even in China. He managed to secure a place behind a window looking upon the scene of the procession, and was thus able to gratify the readers of the *Illustrated London News* with a faithful representation of the interesting event. We fear that these things are only too easily converted into an allegory. The pushing Western world is everywhere forcing its way through the thick barrier of Chinese custom, with what result remains to be seen. It is highly probable that when another Emperor marries, he will have a Correspondent at his elbow throughout the ceremonial, and have his speeches taken down for the benefit of the listening world. The interviewer is abroad, and the coy East seeks in vain to oppose his progress. Indeed Mr. Simpson succeeded in gathering a certain amount of gossip which shows that with all precautions even Chinese majesty cannot quite escape the gaze of the world. We learn, for example, that the new Empress is a lady of considerable literary acquirements, and showed her taste soon after her marriage by refusing to allow her studies of the classics to be interrupted by the vulgar intrusion of breakfast. The fact reminds us that Mr. Simpson caught some glimpses of the working of the competitive system in this its ancient home. He does not, indeed, give us any account of the papers which are set, nor do we accurately understand what are the qualifications which entitle a man to be the "Chwang-Yuen," or senior wrangler of the Chinese Empire. However, he saw the examination-hall in which the unfortunate students, some of whom go on to the age of seventy or eighty, undergo their tortures. The enclosure, he tells us, resembles a cattle-market. It is surrounded by a wall to keep out all intruders, and in the centre is a tower, whence the watchmen guard against all communication with the candidates. There are ten thousand cells, in each of which a student is confined. They are locked up on three successive occasions, and on each occasion for three nights and days. Tea and food are supplied, and sealed paper is given out to prevent the introduction of previously prepared manuscript. The cells are so small that it is difficult for a stout man to get into one or to turn himself round in it, and Mr. Simpson gives a very thrilling illustration of a place of torment compared with which any seat before Civil Service Examiners or in Oxford or Cambridge schools must be luxury itself. We are not surprised to learn that the examinees are occasionally found dead in their cells, in which case a hole is knocked in the wall and the body thrown out to avoid opening the gates. Mr. Simpson recommends a study of the whole system by intelligent English travellers. Some youthful member of Parliament might perhaps find it worth his while to relieve his studies of blue-books by a personal inspection of the details. He will possibly see what is the state of society at which we shall arrive in a few centuries.

Mr. Simpson made two or three interesting little excursions in China, but we have only space to mention one other observation. He saw a device for raising subscriptions, somewhat on the same plan as this examination arrangement, which we strongly commend to the attention of energetic clergymen in their normal condition—that is

* *Meeting the Sun.* By William Simpson. London: Longmans & Co. 1874.

to say, endeavouring to raise funds for charitable purposes. Mr Simpson saw an enthusiast in a Buddhist temple which was in need of restoration. He was locked into a kind of small wooden sentry-box. A hole in the side enabled him to pull a string which worked the hammer of a bell. He pulled it every few minutes to attract attention to his position. He had only just room to sit upright, and a number of large nails were driven through the side of his box with the points projecting inwards. Whenever a benevolent person paid a sufficient sum, one of the nails was extracted, making the position of the inmate rather less uncomfortable; and a piece of paper was pasted on the spot with the name of the donor. This is really a very ingenious device; and we would suggest to any parish in want of a new church that they should catch a popular clergyman and immure him in such a box in some public place. The effect would no doubt be striking; and he might deliver sermons from his permanent pulpit with singular emphasis. The Chinese devotee in question was, it seems, to be shut up for three years; but probably it would be better to make the duration of the imprisonment depend on the amount of the subscriptions. Perhaps, however, some preachers would then have to look forward to a rather excessive term.

The most amusing page in Mr. Simpson's book is perhaps that in which he gives a specimen of pigeon-English—language which, according to him, is spreading with great rapidity, and possibly destined to establish itself permanently as a means of communication even between natives who speak mutually unintelligible dialects. At present it can hardly be called graceful. The fragments which we give are taken from a translation of "Excelsior." We will only add that the phrase "galow" is said to be untranslatable; but that it has the effect of converting "topside" into an exclamation nearly equivalent to "excelsior." Here is a verse or two; the whole poem is given in Mr. Simpson's pages. "Maskey" means "notwithstanding":—

That mighty time begin chop-chop,
One young man walkey—no can stop—
Maskey snow! maskey ice!
He carry flag vid chop so nice—
Topside-galow!

Him muchee sorry ; one piecey eye
Looke sharp—so—all same my
Him talky largay—talky strong,
Too muchey curio—all same gong,
Topside-galow!

The stanza about the falling avalanche and the St. Bernard monks who hear a voice fall through the startled air become:—

"Take care ! that spoil 'um tree, young man !
Take care that ice, he wont man-man."
That coolin chin-chin he good-night,
He talky "my can go all right."
Topside-galow !

Joss-pidgeon man he soon begin
Morning-time that Joss chin-chin,
He no man see—him plenty fear
Cas some man talky—he can hear,
Topside-galow !

We look forward to the translation of Shakespeare into this delicious dialect. Meanwhile we will only add that, on his way home, Mr. Simpson showed the characteristic spirit of an English Correspondent by diverging to the Modoc war, and apparently running a very considerable risk of leaving his scalp in the lava beds. We congratulate him on his safe return, and hope that he may find many more opportunities for enlightening the British public.

A SMALL COUNTRY HOUSE.*

SO many people begin to build who, from not providing before-hand for all that they want, are eventually unable to finish to their mind within their proposed margin, that any judicious pocket-counsellor must needs be of service to them. And Mr. Kerr's little volume is all the more useful because he does not overload his subject with collateral considerations, but confines himself to advising the proprietor about to deal with bricks and mortar how he may do so without disappointment and vain regrets. It fills a gap which is not provided for either by Mr. Kerr's exhaustive work on the "Gentleman's House" or by Mr. Gervase Wheeler's more compendious *Choice of a Dwelling*. The first of these might give valuable hints to a millionaire who condescended to look into details before building himself a country seat; the second applies to ambitious house architecture in town or country experience which has been gathered among our Transatlantic cousins, who well know how to get comfort for cost in house-building. *A Small Country House* appeals to a section of society whose architectural flights are of necessity limited, and which is concerned in incurring the least possible amount of unremunerative expenditure. It need not shake our confidence in our guide to learn that he accounts the English country house the best residence in the world in point of comfort, domesticity, and family enjoyment. Home-keeping by taste, we have come by experience to a general understanding as to the *sine qua non* of the domestic dwelling; and the result assuredly is, in the main, as Mr. Kerr affirms. But, though "use doth breed a habit in the man," and, in our author's words, "a

perfect stranger ought to have no difficulty in telling, while it is as yet quite empty, not merely which is which throughout the whole number of apartments, but which is the proper place for every essential piece of furniture in every room of a house," it is astonishing how many minds fail to grasp the mystery of "plans, sections, elevation, and perspective." They are constrained to take on trust the elucidations of their architect, which, had they been apprehended in their true significance, might have prevented the larder being planted just where there is no draught and much sun, or the dining-room in a position where the heat will be insufferable at the very hour of its special use. Such mistakes may be avoided by due attention to the book before us, as its aim is to plan the rooms of a house step by step, and even to arrange the characteristic furniture of each in its proper place, the architect instructing the novice in far less professional language than one is accustomed to hear from an expert.

A primary question in the planning of the house and its rooms is that of aspect—a matter of greater moment than prospect, though this is never ignored by a clever architect. Unlike the suburban villa, which must accommodate its face to the road, the country house can turn its back to this and to the north, and secure, if possible, a south aspect. An eye to landscape gardening assists the projector of a house in making the best of the natural features of his site; but the principle should be to get his chief front and outlook south, and facing the lawn and flower-garden, whilst the approach and shrubbery should be on the north and east. On the whole, there is no better aspect for any living-room than the south-east, inasmuch as it catches all that can be desired of the morning sun, and is in shade very soon after the hour of noon. If the considerations of aspect and prospect clash, the latter must be sacrificed, unless we are prepared to accept a baking dining-room to westward, or a drawing-room looking out on a north terrace, "swept from end to end by the east wind." But, as we have said, a little cleverness may usually effect a compromise. A room may have windows in more than one wall; or, to get over the difficulty of including prospect, recourse may be had to projecting windows of various form. The nooks and crevices and unexpected ins and outs of a room thus rendered irregular become not seldom its most delightful lounges, and leave an after-memory in the minds of guests who would regard one room built and windowed "on the square" as very much the same as another. There can be no exception taken to the sound maxim that, if the aspect of the lawn front is south or south-east, the entrance should be from north or east, so as to leave the south and west for the garden. A north entrance is colder than one to the east, but double doors or a portico obviate this drawback. There is, however, no solecism in building so deplorable as that of bringing the drive round to an entrance in the drawing-room front—an intrusion on the privacy to which the owner is reasonably entitled. With such privacy, it may be remarked, a western approach with a western lawn would interfere, as would also a public road on the south. If either are unavoidable, the landscape gardener will have to be summoned to the rescue with shrubs adapted for planting them out; but the necessity need hardly arise if a site is deliberately chosen. There is no harm, by the way, especially with an architect alive to landscape-gardening, in having the office and entrance front identical. All working-places, store-places, larders, and dairies require to be cool, and if the windows seem too inornate to harmonize with a dignified approach, it needs but to call in the intelligent gardener to assist in screening or disguising them. We observe that Mr. Kerr lays down a rule that there must be no "back" to a house—a rule somewhat puzzling to old-fashioned folks. The meaning of it is that the kitchen-yard, laundry-yard, or stable-yard, which is overlooked by the least important of the four fronts of a dwelling-house, must in these days be externally designed with as much care, if not cost, as those which are to meet the eye of more distinguished critics. One reads in novels, and now and then sees still in actual life, back settlements about country houses which are the very model of discomfort and ill arrangement, whilst the guest chambers and front halls are all glorious and stately.

As to internal arrangements, Mr. Kerr gives the first place to the dining-room, with which the service communication from the offices must be direct and immediate, and the route to which from the drawing-room should be spacious, and, as far as may be, stately. The nursery population would no doubt make it another requirement that this route should pass the main staircase, at the top of which it is, we believe, their immemorial custom to watch the procession as it winds its way to consume those cakes and viands which the "cherubs aloft" contemplate only in imagination. On the whole, the aspect of the dining-room should be S.E. for morning sun and evening shade; but if it stand sideways towards N.E., with a window facing that way and a bay to the S.E., such an arrangement is not to be despised. As to shape, the dining-room should be oblong, and there should be a service door or hatch, besides the main door. Mr. Kerr has defined the place of the sideboard, which is an important piece of furniture; but we wish he had found space to discuss an even more important matter—the dining-table—touching the make and build of which we concur strongly with Mr. C. L. Eastlake, that some improvement on the ancient Jacobean pattern would be very far better than the modern telescope table. As to the directness of route from the entrance to the dining-room, we demur to one argument used in its favour—namely, that it is often used as a room of audience or a "speak-a-word" room. This is much better confined to the

* *A Small Country House: a brief Practical Discourse on the Planning of a Residence to cost from 2,000*l.* to 5,000*l.** By Robert Kerr, Architect, Author of the "Gentleman's House." London: John Murray. 1874.

study, odd room, or even servants' hall. About the drawing-room and its arrangements Mr. Kerr gives some excellent hints. It should look on the lawn, and, if possible, open upon it, so as to admit sunshine without sultriness, and court summer breezes, whilst impervious at will to unwelcome wind and weather. In the drawing-room we must to some extent study prospect, in order to preclude the familiar grievance of a lost view; but here, too, a supplementary window may give what is lacking in the chief aspect, and, after all, it is to be remembered that "prospects" tire, but aspect really subserves comfort. Moreover in houses where there is a morning-room of consequence enough to allow of the drawing-room being what Mr. Kerr calls *preserved*—i.e. kept for state occasions—the prospect of the drawing-room is of less moment, as not likely to provoke discussion when the shades of evening are making one view as obscure as another. The terrace and lawn are important accessories to the drawing-room, and it is not amiss to have easy outdoor access from it to the conservatory; but house-planners should beware of connecting the conservatory directly with the drawing-room, morning-room, or even vestibule, as it involves interference with the ordinary ventilation, and is much better detached. Some directions are given for the position of the principal staircase with reference to the drawing-room, the front door, the principal bedroom, and the back-stairs. It may be made the chief feature of a central hall, and minister not a little to its state and consequence. We do not think, however, that it should be visible, except indirectly, from the entrance; on the other hand, it ought not to be in a corner. With it and with the entrance a little excess of spaciousness is not undesirable, and this is a legitimate consideration in the building and planning of a house.

One of Mr. Kerr's most interesting sections concerns the library, though he gauges the average Englishman only too correctly when he gives him the option of a study or business-room instead. Here is the distinction:—

A proper library in a good house is the public morning-room of the gentlemen, for correspondence, newspapers, light reading, or indoor lounging. A study in a smaller house or a parsonage is a smaller room which the master reserves for himself, or in which he accommodates his books. A business-room is very much the same as a study, the distinction rather than difference being, that the occupant is professedly a man of business, and not a student.

A library ought to be in the general group of public rooms; a study may be placed "on the line of demarcation between the family part of the house and the offices," or even over it. It obviously serves better than a library would the purpose of a room of audience. Tastes may differ, and there are doubtless many who, to secure the billiard-room, which they think not even "a small country house" should be without, will put up with a study instead of a library, and devote the difference in cost and space to the 24 feet by 18 which they require for their hobby. But what a dreary place it is, unless when the balls are in motion! and, on the other hand, what a glow of comfort and friendliness reigns in the book-clad sanctum where tables and chairs are arranged conveniently as regards the light, the fire, and the door, where we would have the mantel-shelf as like as might be to that represented in Mr. Eastlake's *Hints on Household Taste*, and in which on a rainy day the most perfect of lounges is to be found. An illustration in the *Life of Dean Alford* exhibits a pattern of what a worker's library should be as regards recessed windows, the arrangement of desks and tables and the like. But this room in a new house should be the special home for old oak furniture, which that at the Deanery of Canterbury does not seem to have been, and we miss the busts or statuettes which should surmount a bookcase if it does not reach the ceiling. The library too, if any room, pleads for exceptions to the rule of a square house, which, our author argues, is the most simple, symmetrical, and saleable. It is much improved by projections, irregularities, and recesses in the wall-space.

We can only give a casual glance at the offices and the bedrooms. Basement offices are a makeshift for which there is little excuse or occasion in the country. Moreover, they would be usurping the place of the cellars, which are even a greater consideration in country houses than Mr. Kerr appears to think they need be, for the dry and well-ventilated receptacles of wine and beer. Not a little influence on the ripening of wine may be ascribed to careful planning of the cellar department, and though it is said that abroad wine is sometimes best matured in proximity to the roof, it may be doubted whether our English stowage of it is not best and fittest. Coal-cellars, mentioned in p. 71, are, we should think, as inconvenient as they are needless in the country; but it is a good hint that a cold larder may find its habitat under the ground-floor with advantage. Larders above ground, and indeed everywhere, require ventilation as well as coolness, and the aspect for their windows should be, if possible, north. Mr. Kerr justly attaches great importance to the arrangements of the butler's pantry, but we do not hold with the desirableness of its opening into the serving-room, or of its having a butler's bedroom attached. A more unquestionable advantage is that it should look out on the drive. A most important matter in planning a house is to shut out the sight, sound, and smell of the offices from the family apartments; and, by parity of reasoning, the nursery corridor should be out of earshot of the guests' bedchambers. It not unfrequently happens that the *nidor* of the cook's operations, cleverly enough excluded from the entrance or staircase corridor, ascends through the nursery passages, and finds its way to the very quarters from which on the ground-floor it has been successfully excluded.

Ingenuity may be tested in preventing this; as also in contriving to get the bath-room contiguous to the guest-chamber front, without imperilling the decorated cornices and ceiling of the drawing-room or dining-room. Perhaps it should find a place in the nursery corridor, as handy as may be to the best bedrooms. There is sound wisdom in prescribing, as is done in p. 80, nurseries for every house, even though there is no immediate need of them. They will serve for bedrooms till the need arises, though we do not advise the excessive forethought of a bachelor incumbent (the first of a series of such) who not only provided nurseries for his new parsonage, but also a wicket-gate at the top of the back stairs, to prevent the children *in posse* from tumbling down them.

Stables and coach-houses form no part of Mr. Kerr's plan, which is perhaps on that account not so comprehensive as it might have been. We might add that in new country houses it is sometimes found possible to provide a prayer-room, which avoids the awkwardness of this family institution clashing with the preparations and gatherings around the breakfast-table. We have seen its want supplied by a happy adaptation of a passage or corridor. But it is invidious to hunt for omissions in a book which provides for every reasonable want.

LLANALY REEFS.*

LADY VERNEY writes with such good intention, and at times so well, that we deeply regret her want of sustained dramatic power, and her frequent lapses into a certain woolliness of treatment; defects which ought not to be allowed to mar the effect of so much idyllic sweetness, and such an accurate knowledge of the places and people of which she treats. She is evidently thoroughly at home on the Welsh coast; and she describes both the scenery and the manners with touches full of that almost unconscious graphic power which is only to be got by perfect familiarity. But with all this outside perception and notable use of local colour, she fails in that subtle exposition of character which constitutes life-likeness; and the action of her little story drags, while her plot, thin as it is, becomes now uncertain and now confused. There is a fatal want, too, of motive in some parts which vitiates the reasonableness of the story; as, for instance, the preservation by Evan Evans of the obscure and well-nigh illegible scraps of paper he had found on the body of poor drowned John Caladine—scraps of paper of no earthly use to him or his, of which he never sought to make money, and which he kept from those concerned, one scarcely knows why, seeing that he got no gain by them, and that he did not seem to have rightly understood their dishonest value to himself by the loss which they were to others. Also we think that the vacillation of the young sailor Piers between his cousin Grace and Winifred Caladine is scarcely consistent with his own nature or with itself. If he had really loved Winifred, even through the triple trial of her levity, her coquetry, and her refusal, was it quite natural that in his moments of peril he should have thought only of Grace? And, again, was his love for Winifred of the kind to command itself to an earnest, self-restrained, God-fearing man, such as he is described, one to whom marriage would be a thing of far more serious import than the gratification of the fancy or the pleasing of the senses? The best men of the class to which Piers Owen belongs think more gravely of marriage than do the gentry who are swayed by a variety of social considerations wanting to the poorer sort; and a girl with as much selfishness and as little true worthiness as Winifred had in the beginning of things, would have found the subjugation of a steady-going religious fellow like Piers a harder matter than Lady Verney has allowed. "I have laid it before the Lord, but He has not directed me," was the answer made by a Cornishman of Piers Owen's stamp, when asked why he did not marry. This was said quite simply and sincerely. Pretty girls and tempting women might abound; but the Lord had given no sign to the pious Wesleyan; and he would have thought yielding to the fascinations of sense, dignified though they were by the name of love, such as those to which Piers gave in so readily, a yielding to the temptation of Satan and a profanation of the holy spirit without which no marriage is sanctified. These are the minor points of character in which writers of good social position so often fail. They judge of human nature as they know it, influenced and modified by the circumstances and education of their own class; and unless they get deeper into the hearts of the people than is usual with the well-to-do classes, they do not understand the strangely different influences which stir and compel those of a lower grade.

The motive of *Llanaly Reefs*, to judge by the concluding note, is a protest against the unseaworthiness of ships and the "radical wrong" of our present system of insurance; and by far the best bit is the description of the shipwreck of Piers and his crew in the rotten old *Mersey* off Cape Horn. In this description Lady Verney goes into details with praiseworthy accuracy; and yet there is a curious lack of cataloguing through it all, as when she speaks of the "stenches" of the forecastle—"wet, foul, dark, and quite unventilated"—the measurement of the Pacific storm wave, the general rottenness of all the material of the *Mersey* from first to last, and how "the tarpaulins were too small to cover the hatchways, the stuff was full of holes, and perished with age and exposure." The picture of Piers's calm determination, which seemed as if it had influenced even the crazy hull of the *Mersey*

* *Llanaly Reefs*. By Lady Verney, Author of "Stone Edge," "Lettice Lisle," &c. London : Smith, Elder, & Co. 1872.

to do her best, is well laid in. We extract the following, which reads rarely well for a lady writer, and as if written from practical experience, or, if Lady Verney will forgive us, as if she had been well coached in the technical terms:—

But the height to which the sea had by this time risen made it impossible to run any longer before the wind, and to lay to was now her only chance. Already a broken sea had passed over her, nearly carrying the helmsman overboard, and putting her in imminent jeopardy. Piers summoned all hands on deck, and stationed each man at his post—every opening was fastened down, the mizen staysail was set, and the ropes manned for taking in some of the canvas forward; then he took the helm himself, and watched and waited. At length there seemed a slight lull; he put the helm hard a lee, and waved his hand as signal to the mate at the forecastle. As the ship flew up to the wind, he saw coming down to windward a huge mountain of water, and seizing a rope's end, he had barely time to secure himself hurriedly to the mizen mast when the roller fell on the deck. All around him, above, below, all was water, green water, and for a moment he thought that he was being carried to the bottom with the ship—but the end was not yet. Slowly the vessel recovered herself, and freed her deck from the weight of water, which would have sent her to the bottom if it could have found its way below; the after sail brought her head up to the wind, and she lay comparatively safe; but the boats had all been shattered, rendered useless, or carried away by the shock, and two hands were missing when the danger was past.

The next paragraph, too, is good, and the significance of the rounding query becomes important read by the light of the last note; but the real value of the extract is in the union of, as it seems to us, experimental knowledge, whether at first or second hand, with a certain poetry of feeling evidently the authoress's own:—

The bad weather became worse; the wind chopped and changed perpetually, while from each quarter seemed to come the coldest and stormiest of the blasts in succession: from the south they blew straight out of the icy solitudes round the Pole, and from the north off the cold, barren, snowy rocks of Terra del Fuego, the most inhospitable land in the world; east or west seemed all alike in the wintry feeling; the men were wet from morning till night, and chilled to the bone by the cutting wind and the hail, so that they could hardly manage the sails. They had pretty nearly, however, now rounded the Cape. "She must feel her own way most part," said the old mate, as, in the storm and the sleet, she began to turn her head northwards. For still the gale was at its height: the fierce wind blew the crest of the waves in sheets of water to leeward, the short day was closing in, and dull blackness overhead; but if all held on, a good ship should have ridden out even such weather in August off Cape Horn. Was the owner at that moment sitting, enjoying the sultry evening with his wife and children round him, and the comforting thought that all risks were fully insured if the "Mersey" did not reach home?

The end of all is the utter destruction of the founder ship, and the temporary salvation of Piers with ten of his crew on a raft which he built and superintended, "standing over each lashing and seizing, to see that all was thoroughly done and no nails used in the construction." The suffering that followed: the hunger and thirst; the men falling off the raft one by one from fatigue and weakness; the shapeless mass of spars lying as a speck in the vast ocean, and almost in the jaws of death; now a porpoise speared; now a few drops of grateful rain, "caught in their lined and a tiny cup or two"; an albatross, which had been following in their wake, swooping down on her prey as the men slipped from their frail refuge to the death that was so near; the disappointment, mingled with superstitious dread, that possessed them when, drifting up to a strange object, they found a water-logged ship—"the light shining through the blackened timbers, hung with barnacles and seaweed, the stanchions standing out bare and ragged against the sky"—which all but Piers cried was the *Flying Dutchman*, and aware they would not go an inch nearer; the stupor of starvation deepening; the old mate, poor Piers' last comfort and chief help, in his turn falling like a stone into the "yeast of waves"; and, finally, the rescue of the five men left out of the ten who had been on the raft when she first pushed off from the ill-fated *Mersey*—all this Lady Verney tells with force and pathos. It is a remarkable bit of writing for a woman, unless she has been indeed assisted by an experienced hand; and should even a few minor technicalities be inexact, that does not mar the power of the whole. It is during these days and nights of wretchedness and peril that Piers thinks continually of Grace. He and the crew sing a great deal in the earlier time, and before that "stupor of starvation" which comes later has made them indifferent to life itself. They sing "sea-songs, hymns, anything that anybody could recollect"; "but there was one couplet which rung in Piers's ears day and night, and it was always in Grace's voice that it seemed to sound." "He could hear it so distinctly that he wondered the others did not perceive it also; he almost seemed to see the singer. It was always Grace now of whom he thought; help and comfort seemed to come naturally through her lips, and to be connected with the very thought of her." Yet on his return home, notwithstanding that he pays Grace so much attention, and is on such terms of loving friendship with her that her own long-cherished love for him seems as if it may now take courage and be glad, he suddenly drifts back to his old entanglement of feeling for Winifred; and the end of the book sees them married and happy, with Grace holding their baby and sweetly content with the second place. This Grace is a divinely unselfish and saintly character; but we owe the author a grudge that she did not give her a brighter fate by making Winifred find her duty and her happiness elsewhere.

Part of the story is connected with a certain "Quillet"—that is, "a piece of Owen Griffith's best field, which had been left away to a daughter (after the fashion of the country) by some far-off ancestor. It had descended to an old woman as obstinate as Owen

himself in defence of her rights, who insisted on her intention to leave it to her nephew, instead of to the direct line and lawful owner, as Owen considered himself to be." The disputed corner was "not much bigger than a pocket-handkerchief," but it was the one shadow in Owen's otherwise radiant lot, and the standing grievance he could not quite get over. The litigiousness of the Welsh character is well touched on here. For all that Owen Griffith is the "good demon" of the story, he is fond of lawyers and law courts, and is for ever hankering after the Quillet, the boundary stones of which gave his plough an awkward turn, while the right of way leading to it interfered with his beans. This grievance about the land is connected with the story by the subsequent proposal of David Hughes, the nephew of the obstinate old woman who is in possession, to Winifred Caladine, when the matter might be brought to an amicable arrangement. His method of offering himself is quaint enough:

"So, miss, you iss out for a walk this so fine evening. It iss well so, as I want to speak quite particular, and it shall be best altogether without my aunt. You must know already this so long while since my desires. Now I shall wish suggest myself to marry ourselves direct. You shall be a great comfortable to me at the mill. You have no parents for to dwell with—mine is so nice home. When shall we be wed?"

But Winifred, who had her heart now full of Piers, as she formerly had her heart full of young Harrison, turns a deaf ear to the Welshman's reasoning, and answers to his assurance that "everybody shall tell you it is quite conformable," "But I don't care what they says; it isn't 'everybody' that's got to be married; it's me!" In view of the case we think she is singularly rational. The main thread of the story, however, is bound up with the papers which Evan Evans took from the corpse of John Caladine, Winifred's father; with which papers are connected a scampish brother who made off to South America with what did not belong to him, a paid debt and no vouchers forthcoming, and the subsequent impoverishment of the widow and orphan—the latter being this same Winifred who is left to the guardianship of Owen Griffith. All this part about the papers and the debt is a little confused in the telling, and not very clearly made out in the design. Legal matters are seldom treated in a satisfactory way in novels, and Lady Verney only follows the multitude when she defines hers less clearly than might have been. Add to the dialect, which somewhat perplexes the unaccustomed reader, though we are happy to say the spelling is less uncouth than many other authors would have given it, and we have reason enough for our sense of confusion. There are other graphic sketches on which we have not touched; such as the danger of Piers in his walk across the sands, and the "crossing of the herds"—with the imminent peril of the white heifer, who, "instead of enduring passively the discipline of pain with the mass of the crossing multitude," leapt from the ranks, and very nearly drowned herself in a miniature maelström. Both are photographic, and evidently taken from the life.

On the whole, though we cannot welcome *Llanaly Reefs* as a masterpiece, we can praise it heartily as a pretty, well-intentioned, and in parts excellently written, story—the best parts being the descriptive, the weakest the psychological.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

CARL VON NOORDEN'S History of the War of the Spanish Succession* deserves an honourable place in the series of useful, practical, and workmanlike histories with which Germany is at present enriching European literature. The works thus collectively indicated may be described as all belonging to the school of Ranke, and as the works of writers who have rather made it their task to elucidate the obscure and tortuous policies of Cabinets than, like Michelet or Macaulay, to paint graphic panoramas of the life of nations. Their common peculiarity is their diplomatic character in both senses of the term—the extent to which they depend upon archives now for the first time brought to light, coupled with a most praiseworthy sobriety in the use of these materials. Von Noorden's History, an admirable type of the class, is evidently based upon a thorough knowledge of the politics of the period, manifested in the condensed presentation of results rather than in the accumulation of references, and never pedantically obtruded. At the same time, the more ordinary and traditional qualities of an historian are by no means wanting, as is shown in the lucid treatment of battles, sieges, and campaigns, and in such masterly summaries as the brief sketches of the condition of Poland and Portugal at the opening of the war. Though nominally restricted to Spain, the scope of the History is in fact a very wide one, extending over the whole of Europe, all the members of whose body politic were participants in the conflict. It comprehends the years 1705-1707, including such brilliant feats of arms as the battle of Ramillies and the siege of Barcelona, a general survey of the condition of the North of Europe, and a miniature history of the Union of England and Scotland. Several remarkable personages are described, who had been omitted by former historians, as, for example, the intriguing Primate of Poland; and justice is rendered to several interesting transactions hitherto left in the shade, such as the Prince of Darmstadt's successful defence of Gibraltar.

* *Europäische Geschichte im achtzehnten Jahrhundert*. Von Carl von Noorden. Abth. 1. Der spanische Erbfolgekrieg. Bd. 2. Düsseldorf: Buddeus. London: Williams & Norgate.

August von Druffel's collection of documents * relating to the history of the German Empire during the sixteenth century promises to be a most valuable storehouse of State papers. The first volume, embracing the period from 1546 to 1551, alone comprises 863 documents in 900 pages. They are nearly all despatches from crowned heads and ambassadors, some formal and official, others confidential diplomatic reports. Among the latter the correspondence of the Spanish Ambassador at Rome during the Conclave of Julius III., which so nearly resulted in the election of our countryman Cardinal Pole, is particularly entertaining. The private correspondence of Charles V. and his brother Ferdinand is very valuable. Some of the documents have been printed already, but in many cases inaccurately. The more important papers are given at length, others are summarized with considerable fulness. It is to be hoped that so extensive an undertaking may be completed on the scale on which it has been begun.

The additional details of Napoleon's journey from Fontainebleau to Elba †, collected by Baron von Helfert, cannot be said to add much to our knowledge of the subject; the compiler nevertheless deserves the credit of having prepared, from old and new sources, a very attractive book. The whole situation is highly dramatic, and one of the most memorable examples of the vicissitudes of greatness. We can hardly consider it so derogatory to Napoleon as it appears to Baron von Helfert. The position of a great sovereign and mighty conqueror disguised as a postilion to escape being torn in pieces by his own subjects, and indebted for his life to the protection of his enemies, is indeed sufficiently painful and ridiculous, but the disgrace attaches rather to the mob than to the victim of their fickleness and ferocity. Passive courage was not Napoleon's forte; but, on the whole, he seems to have encountered a peculiarly trying peril with as much self-possession as could reasonably be expected in a man of his excitable temperament. Baron von Helfert adduces some strong reasons for disbelieving in his alleged attempt to commit suicide at Fontainebleau.

Madlle. von Assing's last is generally her best; and this time she has surpassed all former feats in the way of book-making and mystification. "From Varnhagen's Remains, Letters Home from the University" ‡, would of course be generally interpreted as the title of an addition to Varnhagen's own valuable correspondence. On discovering that they are no such thing, but simply the letters of a hitherto unheard-of Adolph Müller, and that their sole connexion with Varnhagen is that he had them in his possession and at one time thought of editing them, the temptation to throw the book out of the window is nearly irresistible, and would be wholly so if any probability existed that the fair editor might at the moment be passing along the street. Failing this inducement, we turn to the letters, but can find no adequate reason for their publication. They are certainly very creditable to the writer, but only as might be the case with the correspondence of any amiable, earnest young man, accustomed to discuss serious subjects with youthful frankness, and ardent in the expression of his family affections. If they have any value, it is as indications of the direction in which the student mind of Germany was then tending, and of the influence exercised by Fichte, Schelling, and Novalis, the Carlyles and Ruskins of 1804-10. The writer, a young physician, died prematurely; many circumstances connected with his death are extremely touching, but ought never to have been published. The most characteristic passage of the book is the preface of Madlle. Assing herself, in which she observes that, having been taxed by evil-disposed persons with violating private confidences and publishing rubbish, she desires all such to take notice that she does not value their remonstrances one straw, but proposes to labour in both vocations even more abundantly for the future.

The autobiography of Louise Seidler § belongs to a very different class of literature; it is as full of matter as it is simple and genuine. The author, a lady artist, attained no particular eminence in her profession, and does not seem to have been remarkable for intellectual gifts; but her cheerfulness, helpfulness, and ardent though unobtrusive admiration of everything excellent, qualified her to be the humble friend of numerous distinguished persons, whose kindness she has repaid by recording her acquaintance with them with perfect good feeling and good taste. She was patronized by Goethe, and finds an evident pleasure in dwelling on the numerous instances of his benevolence. Her acquaintance with him immediately preceded the death of his wife. The household was then more tranquil than had always been the case. Goethe's attachment to a partner apparently so ill matched with him is attributed by Fräulein Seidler partly to his respect for genuine nature in any form, and partly to Christiane's tact in withdrawing troublesome and disagreeable matters from his attention. At a later period we find our artist in Rome, where she resided many years, and was intimately acquainted with Niebuhr, Bunsen, Henriette Herz, Overbeck, and other celebrities, all of whom are noticed in a genial and amiable spirit. The pleasant little book has suffered in some degree from

the infirmity of the author, whose sight failed her before her death.

Professor Stark * is an archaeological scholar, and antiquarian topics form the principal portion of his very interesting travels in Greece and the Turkish Levant. He was at Ephesus when Mr. Wood's excavations commenced, and gives a clear account not merely of the site of the great temple, but of the topography of the ruins in general. He also describes Troy, Sardes, and the Niobe rock, as well as the recent discoveries at Athens, adding an exquisite photograph of a new bas-relief. He has not the less an eye for the aspects of modern times, for the picturesque and varied bustle of Constantinople, the inconveniences of quarantine at Syra, and the pleasant domestic life of a cultivated Greek family at Athens. His view of Greek progress, so far at least as the development of intellectual life and the revival of industry are concerned, is highly encouraging, and he leaves us fully impressed with his competence to pronounce upon the subject.

Bruno Bauer †, at one time named along with Strauss and Feuerbach as a leader of the revolutionary school of theology in Germany, has of late years fallen into almost complete oblivion. Not a little soreness on this account is apparent in his recently published volume, in which he carps discontentedly at the more popular works of Strauss and Renan, and tries to outbid both by a paradoxical attempt to make Philo the originator, not merely of the Alexandrine doctrine of the Logos, but of New Testament theology in general.

The Grand Duchy of Baden ‡ is in a manner classic ground in the contest between Catholic States and Catholic Churches, the Baden Government having begun their endeavours to restrict the power of the Church at a period when nearly all others were treating it with deference. The quarrel seems to have extended to nearly every subject on which the two powers can come into collision, and to have resulted in a complete victory for the State, which its historian, Dr. Emil Friedberg, regards as of happy augury for the result of the greater conflict now pending in the Empire. It would seem, however, that the Baden Government abstained from venomous strife by any needlessly harsh or offensive proceedings. Dr. Friedberg's work, which is written purely from the legal point of view, is of great value, if only from its copious appendix of official documents. It must be said that his own style seems formed upon the model supplied by these papers.

The philosophy of Edward von Hartmann is becoming more and more the subject of discussion in Germany. The main ground of its success, apart from the ability and liveliness of its exposition, is no doubt that of all existing philosophies it is the least metaphysical, and the one in which the greatest respect is paid to the observations of physical science. Hartmann would never have committed Hegel's error of quarrelling with Newton on mere *a priori* grounds. His views are wholly based on the scrutiny of nature. The theory deduced from this observation presents no striking novelty. Hartmann's "Unconscious" is merely Spinoza's *natura naturans* regarded from the point of view of modern science; and in its practical application his philosophy reproduces the ethics of Schopenhauer. The Spinozistic and Schopenhaueristic halves of the system seem to have no necessary connexion. Spinoza, the most consistent of thinkers, was essentially an optimist; and the difference between him and his modern representatives sometimes seems rather a matter of bile than of brain. Such would seem to be the opinion of the younger Fichte, whose latest and almost testamentary work § is evidently called forth by Von Hartmann's, though this writer's name rarely occurs in it. The sanity and sobriety of Fichte's ethics are refreshing after the gloomy paradoxes of Schopenhauer's school; his vindication of Theism is more difficult to appreciate, from his adherence to the old metaphysical terminology. It seems evident that the ideas which metaphysicians find so much difficulty in dissociating from this peculiar dialect have already become the property of the world in a simpler and more intelligible way. Fichte's engaging candour and equitable temper are beyond praise; the latter part of his essay betrays a tendency to mysticism, not unshared by Hartmann, who is far from treating narratives of somnambulism and clairvoyance with disrespect. Dr. Volkelt's || essay on the two main factors of Hartmann's philosophy is another important contribution to the history of the subject. The writer is a disciple of Hegel; his method is strictly metaphysical, and he seems not to apprehend the revolution effected in abstract research by the progress of natural science, a revolution only comparable to that effected in science itself by the application of the inductive method of Bacon.

The late Mr. Prince-Smith's tract on Public Economy ¶ is not, as the title and the author's reputation would have led us to expect, a contribution to politico-economical, but to political, science. It

* *Nach dem griechischen Orient. Reise-Studien.* Von K. B. Stark. Heidelberg: Winter. London: Williams & Norgate.

† *Philo, Strauss und Renan und das Urchristenthum.* Von Bruno Bauer. Berlin: Hempel. London: Williams & Norgate.

‡ *Der Staat und die katholische Kirche im Grossherzogthum Baden seit dem Jahre 1860.* Von Emil Friedberg. Zweite bis auf die Gegenwart fortgeführte Ausgabe. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. London: Williams & Norgate.

§ *Die theistische Weltansicht und ihre Berechtigung.* Von J. H. Fichte. Leipzig: Brockhaus. London: Williams & Norgate.

|| *Das Ueberwusste und der Pessimismus. Studien zur modernen Geistesbewegung.* Von Dr. J. Volkelt. Berlin: Henschel. London: Williams & Norgate.

¶ *Der Staat und der Volkshaushalt. Eine Skizze.* Von John Prince Smith. Berlin: Springer. London: Williams & Norgate.

* *Briefe und Acten zur Geschichte des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Bayerns Fürstenhaus.* Bd. I. Bearbeitet von A. von Druffel. München: Kiefer. London: Williams & Norgate.

† *Napoleon I., Fahrt von Fontainebleau nach Elba.* Von J. A. Freiherrn von Helfert. Wien: Braumüller. London: Williams & Norgate.

‡ *Aus dem Nachlass Varnhagens von Ense. Briefe von der Universität in die Heimath.* Leipzig: Brockhaus. London: Williams & Norgate.

§ *Erinnerungen und Leben der Malerin Louise Seidler.* Aus handschriftlichen Nachlass zusammengestellt und bearbeitet von H. Uhde. Berlin: Hertz. London: Williams & Norgate.

[February 21, 1874.]

is an able and temperate defence of the existing institutions of Germany as the best adapted to the actual situation, without, however, contesting the possible abstract superiority of forms grounded on other principles, or the probability that these may be reduced to practice under certain contingencies. The author's main test of the expediency of an institution is apparently the degree in which it tends to maintain power in the hands of an enlightened class.

Dr. Baumann has performed an eminently acceptable task in his able analysis of the political philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*, to which he has prefixed a lucid and interesting essay. Aquinas hardly appears to have made any great original contribution to thought in this department; his principal achievement is to have harmonized and combined the two infallibilities between which he found himself. His system is built upon the foundation of Aristotle, on which, the works of the Stagirite being silent on the subject of Papal infallibility, the latter dogma is easily superimposed. So long as Aquinas adheres to Aristotle he provokes no other comment than that his adhesion is very close; but when he supplements his master's theory by the assumption that good government and morality are not to be regarded as an end, but simply as a means to the ulterior object of eternal felicity, and the further assumption that this is only to be obtained within the bosom of the Church, he is logically committed to a theory of persecution. The gist of Dr. Baumann's reasoning seems to be that consistent Catholics cannot avoid being persecutors in theory, unless in the exceptional case allowed by Aquinas—namely, when they are not strong enough. At the same time Dr. Baumann does not seem inclined to depose the Infallible Church merely to set up the Infallible State in its room; and expresses his apprehensions lest some of the views recently broached respecting the ethical mission of the State should tend to the establishment of a despotism as pernicious as the ecclesiastical to intellectual freedom, if less perilous to life and limb.

The condition of Alsace and Lorraine for the last three years is justly described by Dr. Schriker † as one of apathy and interregnum. The people have had to sit still while others have been legislating for them in a capital which, though assured that it is their own, they persist in regarding as that of an alien and an enemy. It is therefore a serviceable performance to bring together in one compendious collection the laws by which the political life of these provinces is henceforth to be regulated, as well as the debates which reveal the animus of the enacting parties. To judge by the recent elections, this well-intended performance has not effected much towards the conciliation of the Alsace-Lorrainers; perhaps, however, as it is in German, they have not read it. It will be found very useful by foreigners who, whether from an appreciative or a critical point of view, may desire to study German methods of dealing with a conquered territory.

The history of the system of communication in Alsace-Lorraine must necessarily be mainly of local interest. Herr Löper ‡ appears to have been a diligent collector of everything relating to the subject.

Though dealing with abstruse questions of Oriental jurisprudence, and bristling with Sanscrit quotations of terrific appearance, Dr. Mayr's treatise on the Indian Law of Inheritance § is nevertheless anything but dry. Treating of the domestic life of an ancient civilized people, our kinsmen in blood, and not alien in intellectual organization, it incidentally throws much light on the development of culture and social order in Europe. It is divided into three sections, respectively discussing the general principles by which the distribution of property was regulated, the degrees of succession, and the position of the female sex with reference to this subject.

By hearkening to the note of the cuckoo the immortal Wordsworth was temporarily impressed with the conviction that this so solid-seeming earth was in reality but an unsubstantial fairy place. Something of the same illusion is evoked as we listen to the practical Director of the Prussian Post Office—the inventor, we believe, of post-cards—seriously discussing the feasibility of the employment of balloons as an auxiliary to the regular post.|| Dr. Stephan is, indeed, far from asserting the practicability of this improvement at present; he regards it, however, as an aim to be kept distinctly in view, and gives his reasons for the faith that is in him. He is not perhaps altogether exempt from the usual fallacy of projectors in inferring from the opposition excited by railways, telegraphs, and similar inventions, that everything received with a corresponding incredulity must be equally feasible—a manifest abuse of the argument from analogy. We must add that it will take a great deal to convince us that a balloon sent up from Paris was ever found in a bush in Natal. Dr. Stephan, however, is perfectly right in drawing attention to a fact commonly ignored—the steady if tardy progress of the scientific method in aerostation, and the tendency of every improvement to increase the aeronaut's control over his machine. It is also apparent that there are parts

* *Die Staatslehre des h. Thomas von Aquino. Ein Beitrag zur Frage zwischen Kirche und Staat.* Leipzig: Hirzel. London: Williams & Norgate.

† *Elsass-Lothringen im Reichstag.* Von Dr. August Schriker. Strassburg: K. J. Trübner. London: Trübner & Co.

‡ *Zur Geschichte des Verkehrs in Elsass-Lothringen.* Von C. Löper. Strassburg: K. J. Trübner. London: Trübner & Co.

§ *Das indische Erbrecht.* Von Aurel Mayr. Wien: Hölder. London: Trübner & Co.

|| *Weltpost und Luftschiffahrt. Ein Vortrag.* Von Dr. Stephan. Berlin: Springer. London: Trübner & Co.

of the earth where the regularity of the atmospheric currents would render the direction of balloons comparatively easy for a large portion of the year. The lecture, which is animated by the most genial spirit, contains many interesting particulars respecting postal affairs in general. In England, it appears, the average annual number of letters is 29 per head; in Switzerland, 20; in Germany, 14; in France and Belgium, 12; in Austro-Hungary, from 4 to 5. Dr. Stephan actually has the temerity to appraise the amount annually contributed to the German Exchequer by love-letters, which, reckoning those of betrothed lovers alone, he estimates at ten millions of dollars.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

THE UNITED STATES.

The Annual Subscription to the SATURDAY REVIEW, including postage to any part of the United States, is £1 10s. 6d., or \$7 50 gold, and may be forwarded direct to the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, or to Mr. B. F. STEVENS, American Agency, 17 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London. International Money Orders can be sent from any office in the United States, and Subscriptions, payable in advance, may commence at any time.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF NO. 956, FEBRUARY 21, 1874:

Mr. Gladstone's Resignation.
The New Ministry. The New Parliament.
The Emperors at St. Petersburg. The Irish Elections.
The Imperialists and the Septuaginta. Educational Aspect of the Elections.
Railway Accidents and Shipwrecks.

The Bengal Famine.
The Mission. Highland Constituencies.
Ecclesiastical Geography. The Pantechimon. Undogmatic Belief.
The Dauphin Again. The Swiss Army.
The White Pilgrim.

Newman's Historical Sketches.
The Treasury of Languages. Geikie's Great Ice Age. Ribblesdale.
The Venetian Archives. Meeting the Sun. A Small Country House.
Llanaly Reefs. German Literature.

CONTENTS OF NO. 955, FEBRUARY 14, 1874:

The Elections—Mr. Disraeli's Materials for a Government—The Conservative Reaction—Mr. Disraeli at Buckingham—The Bengal Famine—The Ashantee War—France—Missing Members.

Literary Coincidences—Strauss—The Discontented Woman—The Club at Election Time—M. Michelet—The Latest Scheme of Swiss Federal Reform—Parasites of the Press—Hours of Polling—American and English Theatres.
Tales from the Field—The Alps of Arabia—William Ellis, the Missionary—A Whaling Cruise—Miss Macarthur's School History of Scotland—Archdeacon Freeman's History of Exeter Cathedral—Marital's Treatise on Etching—To Rome and Back—An Old-World Duel in Hexameters—The Gilded Age.

London : Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

THE SOCIETY of PAINTERS in WATER-COLOURS.—
The WINTER EXHIBITION of SKETCHES and STUDIES will CLOSE on Saturday next, February 24. 5 Pall Mall East.—Admission, 1s.

ALFRED D. FRIPP, Secretary.

"THE SHADOW of DEATH."—Painted by Mr. HOLMAN HUNT. Now on View from Ten till Five. 329 Old Bond Street.—Admittance, One Shilling.

DORÉ'S GREAT PICTURE of "CHRIST LEAVING the PRÆTORIUM," with "Night of the Crucifixion," "Christian Martyrs," "Francesca da Rimini," "Neophyte," "Andromeda," &c., at the DORÉ GALLERY, 32 New Bond Street. Ten to Six.—Admission, 1s.

ART-UNION of LONDON.—Subscription, One Guinea.—Prizeholders select from the public exhibitions. Every Subscriber has a chance of a valuable Prize, and an IMPRESSION of a large and important ENGRAVING by A. WILLMORE, from the Original Picture by E. W. COKE, R.A., "Dutch Trawlers." Now ready for delivery.

444 West Strand. EDMD. E. ANTRUBUS } Lewis POCOCK } Hon. Secs.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT in INDIA.—EXAMINATION FOR DIRECT APPOINTMENTS IN 1874.

Candidates intending to present themselves at the Examination already advertised as to be held after Easter 1874, are requested to send their names without delay to the Secretary of the Public Works Department, India Office, London, S.W., in order that the forms required to be filled up may be forwarded immediately. They must be British born subjects, not exceeding the age of 24 on July 1, 1874, of sound constitution, and of good moral character, and must have been employed not less than Eight Months as Pupils or Assistants under a Civil or Mechanical Engineer.

India Office, November 1873.

A BINGDON SCHOOL, Berks (Six Miles from Oxford).—This old Foundation has extensive new buildings on a fine bracing site. A Public School training is given to the SONS of CLERKS and GENTLEMEN at a very moderate cost. Academic, Moral, and Physical, are the divisions, one for the Universities, &c.; the other for the Services, Professional Examinations, and Mercantile Life. The School has valuable Scholarships at Oxford.—Apply to the Head-Master, Rev. E. SUMMERS.